DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 868 EA 011 621

AUTHOR	Kalus, Janet Marie Wolcott
TITLE	Analysis of Hawaii Secondary School Discipline Variables.
PUB DATE	Dec 78
NOTE	288p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, Walden University
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC12 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role; Community Relations; Correlation; *Crime; Discipline Policy; *Discipline Problems; Drug Abuse; Parent Participation; *Principals; Questionnaires; School Community Relationship; *School Size; Secondary Education; Smoking; Stealing; Truancy; Vandalism
IDENTIFIERS	Hawaii

ABSTRACT

It was the intent of this study to examine student discipline problems in twenty-one high schools on the island of Oahu in Hawaii. Literature was reviewed concerning the youth revolution as it affects students in Hawaiian public schools and concerning discipline problems unique to Hawaiian public schools. Data were collected through a questionnaire administered to selected students, teachers, and school administrators. Principals reported truancy as the most frequently occurring problem. Burglary, vandalism, smoking, and drug use were marked by most principals as occurring either "frequently" or "occasionally." Fighting and disorderly conduct occurred with moderate frequency. Principals reported eight teachers had been assaulted by students in the past year. Brush fires and fires in trash receptacles were problems in almost half the schools. More than half the principals reported arson at their schools in the past year. It was established that a school's enrollment size is positively correlated with crime rate. No association was found between school-community relations and crime rate. A correlation was established between high parental interest in school and low crime rate. Twelve recommendations were suggested, including that principals ought to have high academic and behavior expectations for the school. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170868

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ANALYSIS OF HAWAII SECONDARY SCHOOL DISCIPLINE VARIABLES

By

Janet Marie Wolcott Kalus

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Kalus

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

B.A., California State University, Long Beach, 1961

M.A., California State University, Long Beach, 1962

Richard L. Hamblin Ph.D.

Richard L. Hamblin, Ph.D., Advisor
Associate Professor of Education
California State Polytechnic University

EA 011 621

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

WALDEN UNIVERSITY
December 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY. 1

Purpose of the Study. 4
The Problem of the Study. 6
Hypothesis of the Study 7
Significance of the Study 7
Limitations of the Study. 8
Definition of Terms 9
Organization of the Remaining Chapters. . . 11

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 12

Introduction. 12
The Youth Revolution. 12
The Causes of Student Unrest. 21
Hawaii's Public School System 38
Discipline Problems in Hawaii 42
Corporal Punishment 45
Legal Considerations. 51
Implications for Principals 72
The Principal's Responsibility. 85
Summary 99

III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY. 107

Introduction. 107
Basis of Selection of the Sample. 108
Development of the Instrument 110
Distribution and Return 112
Treatment of the Data 113

IV. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY. 116

Hypotheses of the Study 116
School Size 117
Grade Structures. 117
Geographic Location of Community. 118
Socioeconomic Level of Community. 118
Enrollment Trends 119
Student Ethnicity 120
Security Programs 120

School-Community Relations. 122
Parental Cooperation with the School. . . . 123
Teacher Cooperation 123
Support from Superiors. 124
Dissemination and Enforcement of Rules and Regulations. 124
Location of Occurrence. 124
Period in Time of Occurrence. 125
Frequency of Occurrence 126
Special Programs. 127
Circumstances Hindering Authority 127
Status of Discipline Problems 129
Factors Related to Discipline Problems. . . 130
Good School Discipline. 131
Summary 132
Teacher Respondents and Schools 136
Information from Respondents. 136
Summary 145
Student Respondents and Schools 147
Information from Respondents. 148
Summary 153

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . 156

Summary 156
Summary of Findings 157
Conclusions 162
Recommendations 164

BIBLIOGRAPHY 166

APPENDICES 176

TABLES

Page

1. Schools Ranked by Juvenile Arrests. 115
2. Geographic Location of Communities of Participating Schools. 118
3. Socioeconomic Levels of Communities of Participating Schools. 119
4. Rate of Growth of School Community. 120
5. Student Ethnic Representation in High Schools Surveyed 121
6. School Security Programs. 122
7. Frequency of Occurrence of Various Discipline Problems in the High Schools. . . . 126
8. Factors that Hinder the Authority of the Principal. 128
9. Status of Discipline Problems 129

DEDICATION

This work is lovingly dedicated to my husband, Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Kalus, U.S. Marine Corps, whose steadfast encouragement, confidence and faith supported me in accomplishing this endeavor, and to our friend, the late Marine Corps Major Robert E. McNew, B.A., M.A., J.D., whose example was a source of intellectual inspiration. I would also like to express a heartfelt mahalo nui loa to two gentlemen, Lt. Michael D. Kiniry, U.S. Navy, and Dr. Rick L. Hamblin, who assisted me most graciously in accomplishing this endeavor.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Lack of student discipline continues to be prominent on the list of problems facing the public schools of the nation, as it has during eight of the last nine years, according to annual Gallup surveys of "The Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools" (70:28).

In a report published by the National School Public Relations Association, Jones discussed the discipline crisis in schools. Statistics validated comments by concerned administrators that across the nation teachers work in a state of fear, at times subjected to assaults, harassment, intimidation, and rape (60:1-2). Unlawful and violent acts by students on campuses have occurred with so much more openness and defiance than in the past that the physical safety of individual students is in jeopardy. The results of a survey conducted for the report indicated that school administrators in many communities share the problems that some critics attribute to a "breakdown in the enforcement of discipline" (60:1-2).

Public pressure is demanding enforceable school rules as communities across the nation insist that action be taken to eliminate student behavior disorders that disrupt classrooms or threaten life and limb of those in thousands of public schools. Because the community has an investment of great magnitude, it has been concerned with the competence of the schools. Intimately related to the problems of discipline is the economy of operation of the school for which the principal is held responsible to the community-at-large.

When speaking of "the responsibility of the schools," there was an inherent reference to the persons upon whom this responsibility rests. Although teachers are in closest contact with students, and though there can be little learning unless there is also good discipline, neither good teaching nor good order can be achieved without well-defined policies and definitive plans or procedures. In most public schools it is the principal's responsibility to establish general patterns of control, order, conduct, and behavior of students in classrooms, halls, and on school-grounds. The principal also must handle unusual cases brought to his or her attention by staff members. It is the principal who must gain the cooperation of parents, and of the community, through the school's public relations program.

Escalating rapidly, violence and vandalism became one of the foremost problems of the nation's schools. The "crisis" peaked with the April 1975 release of the Preliminary Report of the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency by its chairman, Senator Birch Bayh. The subcommittee concluded from a 1973 survey of 516 school districts with enrollments of 10,000 or more students, that between 1970 and 1973:

School-related homicides increased by 18.5%

Robberies increased by 36.7%

Rapes and attempted rapes increased by 40.1%

Assaults on students increased by 85.3%

Assaults on teachers increased by 77.4%

Burglaries of school buildings increased by 11.8%

Drug and alcohol offenses on school property increased by 37.5%

Dropouts increased by 11.7%

The number of weapons confiscated by school authorities increased by 54.4% (62:5-6)

The Senate subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency reported that in 1977 school violence had become so common that the only difference between "tough" city schools and those in the suburbs was one of degree. In a three-year period attacks on teachers were up nearly 80 percent, and assaults on students up 85 percent. The National Education Association believes that only 10 percent of the violent incidents are ever reported (77:6).

In January, 1978, HEW Secretary Califano released a study by the National Institute of Education reporting that more than 5,000 teachers are assaulted each month in America's schools. About 1,000 incur injuries serious enough to require medical attention. In any given month, about 6,000 teachers have something taken from them by force, by students using weapons or threats. Many thousands of students are subjected to violence and theft (76:2).

On the day he released the study, Califano remarked, "Schools that should be centers of teaching and learning basic skills have become centers of danger and violence for teachers and students." This is a situation, Califano said, that "warrants the attention of every school superintendent, principal, teacher and parent in urban America" (76:2).

Because of the widespread criticism levied against high schools and their administrators, an examination of the role of the principal in maintaining discipline, as well as selected characteristics that may be associated with school discipline problems, was of prime importance. A close look at the structure of the school as it affects the student, the effect of the size of the school and the socioeconomic community, the relationship of teaching, defined rules and regulations, the school's authority, and the active support of all school personnel and parents in matters of school discipline were areas that needed to be investigated.

Purpose of the Study

The concern of this study was to determine in what ways the high school principal influences discipline in his or her school and the major influences of outside factors upon student behavior.

The purpose of this study was to:

1. determine the types of discipline problems a high school principal must be prepared to handle
2. discover methods currently being used in dealing with discipline problems

3. examine school characteristics that may be associated with discipline problems

4. ascertain from principals their views regarding the degree of support they receive from their superiors, from staff members, from parents, and from the community, and

5. through a questionnaire approach, determine the influence principals hold in the area of discipline.

More specifically, this study was designed to provide answers to the following questions:

1. How frequently and in what places on the high school campus do various kinds of behavior problems occur?

2. Do principals believe they have enough authority to deal with discipline problems that occur at their school?

3. When handling discipline problems, do principals feel that they receive the support they need from those in positions of higher authority?

4. In matters of discipline, what cooperation do principals receive from teachers, parents, and the community?

5. To what extent do principals pursue school-community relations?

6. Do principals have defined rules and regulations that are consistently enforced?

7. Do principals feel that high behavior and academic standards for the school are important?

8. What special high school programs have been instituted to combat discipline problems?

9. Is there a relationship of discipline problems to such factors as size of school, socioeconomic level of the community, and parental cooperation?

10. What ingredients are needed to achieve better school discipline?

The Problem of the Study

The intent of this study was to establish data regarding specific disciplinary procedures and actions reported by high school students, teachers, and principals on the island of Oahu in the state of Hawaii.

In order to establish such data, the following hypotheses were examined:

1. High schools in which principals exert strong leadership have fewer discipline problems than high schools in which principal leadership is weak.

2. High school principals who insist on high behavior and academic standards for the school have fewer discipline problems than those principals who do not.

3. High schools in which principals have established defined rules and regulations and vigorously enforce school policies have fewer discipline problems than high schools in which principals do not consistently enforce school policy and have ambiguous rules and regulations.

4. Where high school principals maintain extensive school-community relations, discipline problems are fewer than in those high schools where little school-community relations exist.

5. High schools where teachers feel the principal is supportive will have fewer discipline problems than those high schools where teachers feel that the principal does not and/or will not support them.

6. School discipline is affected adversely when the principal feels that he or she does not have sufficient authority to deal effectively with discipline problems.

7. Discipline problems vary in kind and degree in high schools, according to the size of the schools.

8. Discipline problems vary in kind and degree in high schools, depending upon the socioeconomic level of the community.

9. The extent to which parents support the high school affects the frequency of discipline problems in that school.

Hypothesis of the Study

A questionnaire instrument was designed and distributed to selected students, teachers, and school administrators to determine causative and resultant factors regarding school discipline and behavior.

In order to determine the role of the principal in maintaining discipline in the high school, a questionnaire instrument was designed, developed, and administered to the principals, teachers, and students of 19 of the 21 high schools on the island of Oahu in the state of Hawaii.

The questionnaires were designed to elicit opinions of students, teachers, and administrators about the pattern of interpersonal relations in the school. The data from the questionnaire were statistically correlated according to the Spearman Rank Correlation.

Significance of the Study

This study was significant in that it provided a distinct statistical verification of the correlation between behavior of students from a well-structured, democratic, high school with definitive guidelines of behavior backed by a responsible and caring principal, versus the behavior of students from a school with nebulous guidelines and an ineffective principal. This study examined through a comprehensive survey those variables such as parental attitude, socioeconomic status, and racial origin which have an indisputable effect on student behavior.

Therefore, this study was designed to obtain information in the search of possible solutions to the discipline problems in Hawaiian high schools.

Limitations of the Study

The data for this study were obtained from nineteen of the twenty-one high schools on the island of Oahu in the state of Hawaii. This study represented (1) high schools of different sizes, (2) high schools of different socioeconomic levels, (3) high schools of differing ethnic patterns of population, and (4) high schools of differing patterns of population mobility. Because of the wide diversity of high schools investigated, it was relatively certain that statements of attitude and factual data were reasonably representative of high schools in Hawaii.

The questionnaire method was utilized to conduct an in-depth study and analyses of the discipline problems encountered by the principal in his or her school, and identifying the ways individual principals dealt with these problems.

Gathering data from students and teachers by the use of questionnaires was the most efficient method available to obtain information from a large number of respondents. The questionnaire was devised as an opinionnaire and thus contained certain inherent limitations. The interview instrument used with principals was considered the most appropriate method to garner pertinent information for this study. Responses from principals included statements of fact, as well as opinions of the respondents, thus they also contained certain inherent limitations.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms have been defined with a concern for semantic clarity.

Assault/Fight: an apparently violent attempt to hurt another; because of the difficulty in most cases to distinguish assaults from fights (persons trying to overcome each other by blows) without an investigation, assaults and fights were grouped together.

Break-in: forceable entry or attempted entry of a school building such as breaking windows, doors, or locks; this includes entry for the purpose of theft and/or vandalism.

Breaking rules: breaking miscellaneous school rules which are not included in other categories, such as riding bikes in the hallways, speeding on campus, or bringing a pet to school.

Complex: in Hawaii a cluster of schools, including elementary, intermediate and high schools, that are usually in close proximity.

Crime rate school: a school may be categorized as a high crime rate school according to the high number of campus arrests, or as a low crime rate school in accordance with the low number of arrests as reported by the Honolulu Police Department in their 1976 annual report.

Discipline problem: a disruption of the educational process that arises from any overt act committed by a student on the high school campus that is in violation of the law or the educational code of the state.

Disorderly/Disruptive behaviors: behaviors which are a nuisance to others and/or which disturb the learning environment such as making loud noises, being verbally abusive to others, or shoving in the corridors.

Drug sale/use: sale or use of harmful or non-prescribed consciousness altering drugs or substances such as barbiturates, amphetamines, marijuana, alcohol, LSD, cocaine, heroin, etc.

Gambling: engaging in games of chance or betting on uncertain outcomes for money or other stakes such as card playing for money, "throw line," "craps," etc.

Healthy school-community relations: two-way open communication between the school and the community.

High school: refers here to public tax-supported schools housing grades ten through twelve, regardless of the organization of the school. Organization of high schools in Hawaii includes grades kindergarten through twelve, seven through twelve, nine through twelve, and ten through twelve.

High standards: excellence of goals or ideals of achievement in the educational program accepted by educators and the community as worthy of attainment.

Hijacking: in Hawaii the use of intimidation or physical force to make an individual surrender money (called robbery in other states). This usually takes the form of students asking for "loans."

Outsider on campus: person on campus without permission to be there (trespasser); person may be on foot or in a vehicle.

School policies: the educational code established by the state Department of Education.

School rules and regulations: a written or understood code of behavior in individual schools, usually based on school policies.

Socioeconomic community: a community may be considered above average, average or below average in cultural and material possessions and opportunities.

Teacher support (from the principal): the performance of all actions in a manner that will

> uphold and strengthen teachers in achieving the results properly expected of each as incumbent of a post in the organization.

Organization of the Remaining Chapters

Chapter II provided a review of the related literature which focused on the factors relative to discipline such as the youth revolution, significant court cases, causes of student unrest, and the responsibility of the principal.

Chapter III presented the design of the study wherein the questionnaires were administered to students, teachers and principals.

Chapter IV discussed the statistical treatment of the data, the findings and conclusions drawn from the data.

Chapter V summarized the entire research and provides recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In an era of change, principals of high schools recognize they must cope with conflict. Conflict is inherent in the operation of the school and the skills to effectively resolve conflict is one measure of effective leadership. Although there are many sources of conflict, externally as well as internally to the school, such as matters of bargaining processes, differing opinions about the direction of change, proposed innovations, differing opinions about relationships of teachers to students, often the seeds of conflict are sown by the students themselves.

The Youth Revolution

In an article, "The Youth Revolution is Over: How it Changed Us," Dalrymple stated that the youth revolution began in 1964 when the Beatles landed in America and the student uprisings at the University of California, Berkeley, occurred, and ended in 1970 with the strikes provoked by the United States intervention in Cambodia. Dalrymple asserted that the revolution

> . . . had its roots in earlier developments . . . including the black civil rights movement of the previous decade, the Sputnik episode, and even in the changes which occurred as an aftermath of World War II.

Further, he said that

> . . . while like most revolutions it was only partially successful, it brought in a very short time the momentous changes characteristic of a revolution, and life in America will never be the same again (26:1).

Dalrymple believed that beneath the surface of the youth revolution with its violent confrontations, strikes, protests, experimentations with drugs, fundamental changes were taking place. These changes included an increased tolerance for diversity, a questioning of the status quo, variety in political opinion, the acceptance of feeling as being of equal importance to reason and intellect, a greater informality in living patterns, a rejection of certain secondary values or rules of the pre-1964 period, such as acceptance of the American political system as being invariably right, the assumption that all things illegal are also immoral and undesirable, and the acceptance of the general forms of the American economic system as being unquestionably desirable. Dalrymple's article concluded that a final characteristic of the post-revolutionary period is the feeling that society is now strongly influenced by its youth. Dalrymple commented:

> . . . the emphasis of middle class Americans on developing children's minds and ability for independent judgments at an early age, encouraged the development of an independent, relatively self-sufficient youth, much less dependent than their predecessors on the approval and support of their elders, and indeed ready to reject those elders when they feel them to be misinformed or superficial. Appeals to these young prople have to be made much more in terms of the situation and the hard facts than in terms of "I will like

> you more if you do such and such." The youth culture has achieved an ability to realize many of its own goals and impose many of its patterns on the rest of society. To this extent the revolution has given us a prefigurative society (26:32).

Thomson noted that the late 1960's were characterized by a youth revolution to which young people responded aggressively. School administrators were forced to deal with student activism, strikes, demonstrations, confrontations, underground newspapers, and militant groups. Reflecting on these developments, Thomson wrote:

> The central point is that the old ways are not good enough. Just talking and listening will not do the job: Today's student wants action. Traditional extracurricular programs will not suffice: Today's student wants social involvement. Benevolence will fall short: Today's student wants a piece of the power (46:338-39).

Describing the youth revolution as a movement against authority, Dobson declared:

> It should now be apparent to everyone that we are in the midst of a very serious worldwide revolution. This cataclysmic social upheaval is being ignited and fueled by the young--the students--the "under thirty" populace. Whether they be in Tokyo, Paris, London, or on the campuses of American universities, these antagonists are united in their opposition to one common target: authority in all its forms. Every institution of authority is now being challenged: the police, the military, the church, the family, the courts, the high schools, the universities, the FBI, the CIA, and the morals and values of society itself. . . . This hostility in the new generation reaches its peak in the minority of young revolutionaries who want to burn and destroy the holdings of the establishment. They have no program of reform; their platform includes nothing but universal destruction--in the vain hope that something better will follow (5:81).

According to Dobson, the breakdown of discipline and respect for authority can be attributed to parents, who have given their children a distorted view of authority, and the schools that have glibly seconded the motion (5:82).

Keniston took the position that in the youthful opposition there is an overlap of two distinct "revolutions," each with a distinct historical origin. He explained as follows:

> The first revolution is the now-traditional but once radical demand for inclusion, citizenship, or "universalism"--the demand that all men be granted the freedoms, goods, and privileges that were once the perogative of a tiny aristocracy or a small upper bourgeoisie. The second revolution is built upon the first: it is the revolution of those who take the freedoms, goods, and privileges of the first revolution for granted, seeing them largely as facts of life. Such people, mostly young, seek some new fulfillment beyond material abundance, some psychological liberation beyond political freedom. They are sensitive not only to the direct oppressions of political tyranny and economic scarcity, but to the more subtle oppressions of psychological repression, group pressures, and social expectation. Basically, they are struggling to define the postscarcity world, to answer the question "What lies beyond affluence?" (8:303).

Thus, Keniston found that student unrest is characterized by a peculiar mixture of the old and the new, the urgent need to fulfill the promises of the past and, at the same time, to define the possibilities of the future (8:317).

Reich in his book, The Greening of America, spoke of the crisis of contemporary life and developed the theme that the youth of America are developing a new consciousness.

> The great question of these times is how to live in and with a technological society; what mind and what way of life can preserve man's humanity and his very existence against the dominance of the forces he has created. This question is at the root of the

> American Crisis, beneath all the immediate issues of lawlessness, poverty, meaninglessness, and war. It is this question to which American's new generation is beginning to discover an answer, an answer based on a renewal of life that carries the hope of restoring us to our sources and ourselves (13:17).

Reich saw the youth revolution as the rejection of many of the values of the Corporate State, of the producing-consuming society, of obsessive materialism. It initiated a whole new set of beliefs, understandings, ways of perceiving and new values and value choices that govern thoughts and actions (13:17-20).

According to Raubinger, Sumption and Kamm, the youth revolution brought about a change in the way young people viewed themselves, and how they perceived society and their roles as members of society. Values once accepted were examined and the earnest quest for meanings in life called to account some of the principles which older generations had accepted without question. The youth became personally and emotionally involved in the civil rights movement and questioned the morality of the involvement of the United States in the war in Southeast Asia. Added to this was the growing awareness that the very environment that sustained life itself was endangered by pollution of the rivers, seas and air and that life on our planet was also threatened by overpopulation. Then, too, excessive materialism, a by-product of technological advance, was held up to scrutiny and was found wanting (12:104).

Although not primarily concerned with the youth revolution, Toffler's book, Future Shock, contained implications for secondary schools, and had a great deal to say about youth in modern society:

> We are creating a new society. Not a changed society. Not an extended, larger-than-life version of our present society. But a new society.
>
> This simple premise has not yet begun to tincture our consciousness. Yet unless we understand this, we shall destroy ourselves in trying to cope with tomorrow.
>
> A revolution shatters institutions and power relationships. This is precisely what is happening today in all the high-technology nations. Students in Berlin and New York, in Turin and Tokyo, capture their deans and chancellors, bring great clanking educational factories to a grinding halt, and even threaten to topple governments. Police stand aside in the ghettos of New York, Washington and Chicago as ancient property laws are openly violated. Sexual standards are overthrown. Great cities are paralyzed by strikes, power failures, riots. . . .
>
> These are indisputable signs of a sick social structure, a society that can no longer perform its most basic functions in the accustomed ways. It is a society caught in the agony of revolutionary change. . . . We are simultaneously experiencing a youth revolution, a sexual revolution, a racial revolution, a colonial revolution, an economic revolution, and the most rapid and deep-going technological revolution in history. . . .
>
> Reaching deep into our personal lives, the enormous changes ahead will transform traditional family structures and sexual attitudes. They will smash conventional relationships between old and young. They will overthrow our values with respect to money and success. They will alter work, play and education beyond recognition. And they will do all this in a context of spectacular, elegant, yet frightening scientific advance (14:165-66).

Toffler maintained that through education, a large scale effort in which there is the widest possible participation must be made to direct human thought to the future and must include participation of the young. If young people are forced into prolonged adolescence and deprived of the right to participate in social decision-making, Toffler alleged that they will grow more unstable and will threaten the system (14:422).

Although college protesters have received most of the attention, there have been more incidents of student unrest in the high schools than in the colleges. Anrig commented:

> We have discovered a great deal of similarity in the surface and basic issues underlying unrest both on the college campus and in the high school. Both typically are concerned with dehumanization of institutional life, inequities in our society, educational irrelevance, and racial and cultural discrimination.
>
> But there the similarity ends. The difference: College disorders tend to be planned, structured, deliberate acts of protest. High school disorders usually are more precipitous, spontaneous and riot-like, touched off by such incidents as the election of cheerleaders all of one race, suspension of a student, or a scuffle between two students. High school disorders also are more often marked by student-to-student conflict and therefore are more physically dangerous than college disorders (20:21).

Walch and Donovan observed that student unrest, beginning in the nation's colleges in 1964, quickly spread, destroying the orderliness of many high schools. However, the trend toward school rebellion actually began to surface during the school year 1968-69. A Columbia University survey revealed that during the fall term of that year, serious disruptions struck one of every 75 public high schools in the country (348 of approximately 26,000). By spring, these escalating hostilities had touched in some manner at least two of every three urban and suburban high schools, it was disclosed in a report to the National Association of Secondary School Principals (66:2-3).

Responses of alarmed school people indicated the gravity of the situation of school unrest. The hazards of teaching in metropolitan schools in the school year 1968-69 brought the subject of "combat pay" into some school salary negotiations. It was even suggested in congressional debate that federal funds might be allotted for such a purpose. Perhaps more significant, in the fall of 1969 the National Association of Secondary School Principals offered its members a new insurance coverage. Under an "Educators' Professional Liability Policy," this organization would guarantee benefits up to $300,000 for personal injury, along with comparable protection for injury to others, as well as bail money and provision for legal fees. This movement for joint sharing of risks indicated the seriousness with which school officials viewed the problems of school unrest (66:5-6).

Larson stated that at its foundation, the youth revolution of the sixties in America was a part of a world-wide movement to restore the dignity of the individual and make the institutions of society more responsive to the needs of man. He believes that this revolution was essentially wholesome, having important and direct implications for all facets of our educational system, and most especially for that facet we choose to call discipline (9:19).

Intermixed with the violence and disruption on the secondary school level, McNassor cited two healthy impulses he felt must not be repulsed:

> The first is a deep longing for a more generous humanity, new ideals to foster authenticity, honesty, and respect for oneself and for others. This is one active element sweeping our society and the world.
>
> The second impulse is for more authentic programmatic participation and responsibility. . . . Its major expression is the desire for more power to change conditions that affect one's well-being. The demand for power and autonomy, as much as it presents dangers and arouses fear in all of us, at its center is the desire for more shared responsibility. We see it on every side. Black power and black identity. Brown people power. Student, youth power. Women power. The road to reconciliation is to devise new forms of responsibility (41:266).

Although student unrest seems to have abated, and the fiery radicalism has disappeared from the school campus, some believe that the right spark could again light at least a flickering flame of activism. Kerr is convinced there will be another wave of activism. He was quoted as saying, however, "I don't know when it's going to come, and I don't know what it will be about." Mentioning a student protest of university holdings in corporations dealing with South Africa, he noted that students told him they didn't want to repeat the mistakes of the last time around. "They didn't want violence this time" (81:4).

An article, "America's Youth," published in U.S. News & World Report, noted that American youngsters no longer are in open revolt, but troubled with new discontents and hangups less explosive but perhaps more profound than those of the sixties. Statistics and studies clearly show that a small minority of troubled youth is growing below the quiet surface of conformity. In the void created by the decline of political and social causes within the "turned-off" generation, the schools' troubles have been multiplying (19:18-19).

Raubinger, Sumption and Kamm stressed that although the critical period was followed by a period of relative quiet, or student apathy, the basic causes for the most part remain. Student activism could surface again. The principal must not only be aware of the evidence of student unrest in his own school, but equally important, he must be familiar with the considerable literature on the subject (12:105).

The Causes of Student Unrest

Citing causes for the upswing in vandalism and violence on the school campus, Neill focused on big-city schools. The most frequently cited causes by big-city administrators are the deteriorating living conditions in many big cities accompanied by the movement of the white population to the fringes or suburban areas; rising costs for services, including schools, accompanied by near empty coffers; overcrowding; separate racial zones often resulting in poverty alongside affluence; increasing youth hostility and alienation in the midst of economically deprived and often educationally starved homes and schools; and, frequently, little or no supervision from parents (62:12).

The public, in general, most often stated the reason for the upswing in school crimes is the decline of discipline among the nation's youth. Following the release of the Senate subcommittee's report on school crime in April 1975, the Washington Star declared in a strong editorial: "School violence didn't just happen overnight. It has grown as discipline has been replaced by permissiveness" (62:14).

The editorial continued:

> Dress and personal grooming codes were allowed to go by the boards; smoking regulations were all but abolished; grades were made to come easier; class-cutting was blinked at or made to seem a lark; swearing and abusive language were tolerated. It was a natural progression to drugs, vandalism and physical violence. Students have been given so many inches, is it any wonder they have taken a mile? (62:14).

The newspaper editorial included in its indictment

> . . . parents who gave encouragement, acquiesced or looked the other way when all this was coming about--who allowed permissiveness and lax discipline to permeate not only the schools but the home and society in general (62:14).

The National Education Association noted that parents, teachers, and administrators all blame each other for failing to deal with the discipline problem:

> Teachers point the finger at parents, who are permissive, hostile, or indifferent. . . . Parents accuse teachers of either leniency or rigidity, and school officials lay the problem on the doorstep of parents who demand stricter rules, then accuse teachers of unfairness when their own children are involved (72:7).

According to Goldstein, "Middle America views discipline as the highest good, the *summum bonum*, a school can offer its clientele for someone else's kid" (34:5). He stated:

> Close examination of the enforcement of rules and regulations points up that in too many instances suburban America views discipline and substantive enforcement of institutional requirements as necessary and desirable for *someone else's* child. The moment *their* child is affected, the requirements, so praised before, become needless, suppressive, and the hallmarks of a bygone era. *And that is one of the fundamental, underlying problems in our public*

secondary schools (33:457).

In searching for the reasons for the lack of discipline and the decline in the moral climate of the nation, Gallup placed first on his list the "enforced idleness of youth." The necessity for children to help with family chores has largely vanished. The government has made it virtually impossible for young people to find work even when they wish to. Work permits must be obtained in many cases, and the minimum wage laws make it uneconomical for most employers to hire young and untrained workers. Consequently, the youth have been effectively removed from the labor market and from nearly every opportunity to learn a trade (31:18).

Secondly, Gallup felt that a great number of parents simply do not know how to cope with their children. At one time, the pattern of child behavior was firmly established by church and home, but in this permissive age, the traditional guidelines for the rearing of children have been almost entirely lost (31:18).

Finally, in Gallup's opinion, schools must also bear their fair share of the blame for the discipline problems and lessening respect for authority. He asserted that "schools have not maintained high standards and have, in fact, acquiesced too often to those who believe that anything difficult should be removed from the curriculum or de-emphasized" (31:18).

A special report published in U.S. News & World

Report, "Violence in Schools," stated:

> Many believe that pressure to keep slow-witted or rebellious youngsters from dropping out has aggravated the discipline problem. The percentage of 16-year-olds and 17-year-olds leaving school has been cut by almost two thirds over the last generation, prompting noted educator Irving Kristol to say:
>
> "The results are not very different from dropping a gang of juveniles in a children's playpen. They proceed to wreck the place and make everyone miserable."
>
> The National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education has urged lowering the mandatory-attendance age to 14 and providing jobs, so frustrated young people can get out and go to work. Compulsory enrollment does not work anyway, the Commission argues, because "in many of the large city high schools, fewer than half the enrolled students attend regularly" (49:38).

Kaser observed that there appears to be wide underlying support, especially among teachers and others close to education, to abolish the compulsory attendance law. He quoted Corsini as saying that "our schools are nothing but part-time reformatories." Noting "common instances as excessive illegal student absences, vandalism, below-expectation performances, and unorganized and organized student gangsterism," Corsini placed the blame on compulsory education (75:1).

An editorial calling for an end to compulsory education cited what is believed to be three compelling reasons to support this view: (1) innocent young people are being forcibly subjected to a violent environment; (2) an awesome violence-breeding boredom has become pandemic in the nation's schools; and (3) the system has failed overwhelmingly to educate and failed on a mass scale (69:4).

Kiernan maintained that a trend has developed among teachers to guide and direct students only in the classroom, leaving the responsibility for controlling misbehavior elsewhere entirely to the administration. A report by the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, an education research group, noted that teachers, particularly in disruptive schools, "feel isolated in their classrooms" and that "an increasing number of teachers admit fear of their students." The report added, however, that:

> Many observers argue that teachers have purposely used the cloak of professionalism and the muscle of collective bargaining to evade what should be their responsibilities for discipline throughout the school (62:14-15).

In testimony before the Senate subcommittee, Shanker stated that crime has increased because steps taken to protect school employees and students have not been effective in major cities. He said that when assaulted, victims are reluctant to report the incident and to press charges because "of the all too prevalent strategem of shifting blame from the assailant to the victim himself." In addition, Shanker pointed out that the accused now has attorneys and civil liberties organizations available to him in the exercise of his right to due process but, in many instances, "the victim of the assault is left to his own devices in pressing his case" (62:15).

Both Shanker and Kiernan testified before Congress that they are leery of the Goss v. Lopez decision which guarantees minimal due process to students prior to short-term suspensions. Shanker said that "there is good reason to believe that the ruling will only serve to create further difficulties for teachers and schools already overwhelmed by discipline problems" (62:15). While maintaining that he fully supports student rights, Kiernan said that the rights of security of one's person and property "has too often been overlooked in the desire to accord fair treatment to those accused of violence, vandalism, or disruption of the school and the community" (62:15-16).

According to Harris, the schools themselves must be faulted for the current problems of vandalism and violence. Harris told the subcommittee that the causes include depersonalization, alienation, outmoded discipline practices, racial hostility, and the increased use of violence in the society and in the world as a means of solving problems (62:16).

Police officers interviewed for the Education U.S.A. Special Report on vandalism and violence expressed a variety of views: (1) Richardson of Los Angeles said, "The more we go into the causes of vandalism and violence, the more we find that kids do it for kicks." (2) Several police officers concluded that a student's misbehavior in such acts as extortion, burglary, "strong-arming," and assaults on other students and teachers "can be traced directly to problems stemming from the home situation." In the case of the child from a lower socioeconomic background, the cause is often child neglect or child abuse. The most prevalent factor among middle-class youthful offenders is the permissiveness of parents. (3) Barnes of the Sacramento, California Police Department voiced the opinion that another influential factor among all youth is that "they do not think of the consequences of their acts." (4) Another officer made the statement that the kind of peer pressure that can lead to disdainful acts is particularly strong "among those youngsters who don't yet have the confidence to stand on their own." (5) Green, security chief of the Los Angeles City Schools, believes that hard-core youth offenders should not go unpunished. He remarked:

> We failed them when they got out of line the first or the second time and someone didn't kick them hard. We fail not only the individual, but by not making the kids see they will be punished for their acts, we are failing other kids as well. They see there is payoff in breaking the law and not much happens to the guy who does it (62:16-17).

Police officials have frequently criticized school administrators, particularly principals, for not reporting incidents that take place in school. Speaking for the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Kobetz stated that some principals are reluctant to report incidents to the police "because of their own personal interests." Brady, School Security Director of Chicago, speaking to the National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, stated that "failure to report incidents is at the heart of school security problems" (62:57).

In its report, The Reform of Secondary Education, the commission alleged that "there is reason to believe that fewer than 10 percent of crimes committed in school buildings, including violent crimes, are divulged." The commission reproached school principals and school boards for their roles in not reporting incidents. According to the commission:

> School principals seem to feel that the disclosure of an assault is a reflection on the school. Consequently, most incidents of crime in schools are handled by the principal within the walls, and are never reported (62:57).

It added:

> . . . Most school boards do not require the maintenance of detailed records of violent incidents. Indeed, principals are often encouraged to pretend it never happened (62:57).

The chairman of the commission, Brown, said in an interview that principals must bear the brunt of the blame for insecurity within schools. Brown maintained that:

> Principals still do not call in police when crimes are committed in the schools. They handle school crimes as discipline problems, negotiating solutions between students and parents of the victim and students and parents of the offender (62:58). Brown charged that "this is a form of plea bargaining at its very worst."

He continued:

> What is tragic is, that because of the "hush-hush" handling of crime by the principals, many thousands of innocent schoolchildren are the victims of school crime--and the situation gets no better. When a teacher is assaulted by a student, everybody gets into the act. The principal is dismayed; the school board is distressed; and the union is so alarmed that it lets the world know about it. But every day, there are hundreds of assaults against students and this is treated as routine, or "business as usual." These assaults have a terrifying psychological effect upon the students who are the victims, but there are so many of them that schools take them in stride, without doing much about them (62:58).

Gangs and the prevalence of drugs are acute problems. Various accounts of the activities of violent urban youth gangs point to the easy availability and extensive use of drugs and weapons, particularly guns. It has been reported that the increase of guns and weapons on the school campus is part of the city's "mushrooming gang problem." In the April 1975 hearings, the Senate subcommittee heard accounts of how drug abuse and school vandalism and violence go hand in hand. Students testified that dope was purchased with money taken to school for lunch or money won shooting craps or stolen, or that stolen property was traded for drugs. One student testified that "a bad trip" will often lead to students returning home to get some kind of weapon which is brought onto school property (62:13).

The glamorization of violence on television and in films was cited several times during the Senate subcommittee hearings as one of the base causes of increasing violence in schools. Lion, director of the University of Maryland's Research Program for Violent Behavior, noted that the flaunting of terror and crime "generates a morbid curiosity, reinforces people's interest in violence and perpetuates the violence" (62:17). The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence concluded in part: "Violence on television encourages violent forms of behavior in daily life which are unacceptable in a civilized society" (62:17). Studies have indicated that "heavy TV watchers tend to overestimate the danger of physical violence in real life" and that children who are heavy TV watchers can become "habituated or desensitized to violence in the real world" (62:17-18).

The issue of violence on television took on pressure from Congress and the public when, in 1972, the Surgeon General in his report to Congress on the conclusions of a $1 million research project said that the evidence was "sufficient to warrant appropriate and immediate remedial action" (36:8). In addition, Leibert, a principal investigator for the Surgeon General's report, after analyzing 50 studies covering the behavior of 10,000 children, ages three to nineteen, stated:

> The more violence and aggression a youngster sees on television, regardless of his age, sex or social background, the more aggressive he is likely to be in his own attitudes and behavior.

Leibert added that one study showed that:

> It was not a boy's home life, not his school performance, not his family background, but the amount of TV violence he viewed at age 9 which was the single most important determinant of how aggressive he was 10 years later at age 19 (36:10).

Efron, taking umbrage with studies of "violence" researchers, stated that "TV researchers know perfectly well that in the real world TV 'violence' just simply does not do what they charge it with doing" (28:24). She noted that the Report to the Surgeon General, written by a jury of 12 social scientists, shows agreement that the problem of analyzing TV's impact on viewers is almost unsolvable by its very nature. She translated the report's findings as follows:

> We don't know very much, yet, about how people work. . . . Every child and adult in America is different. . . . TV content is complex and is perceived differently by every individual's life. . . . We don't know how to test its effects. . . . And when we try to do so, we usually don't understand our own findings (28:24).

The increasing numbers of disorganized families also get a share of the blame for the soaring school crime rate. The fate of disorganization and delinquency is no longer limited to minorities and the poor. Family disorganization is spreading throughout middle class society. Bronfenbrenner noted that:

> In terms of such characteristics as the proportion of working mothers, number of adults in the home, single-parent families, or children born out of wedlock, the middle class family of today increasingly resembles the low-income family of the early nineteen-sixties (67:5).

A National Education Association study of teacher opinion on student behavior provided a similar view. The study showed that teachers place a large share of the blame for student misbehavior on irresponsible parents, broken families, poor living conditions, and inadequate parental supervision resulting from widespread employment of mothers (17:379).

Irwin offered a list of what he believes to be the principal causes of the growth of vandalism in American schools:

1. The breakdown of the family and family control.

2. Glamorization of violence on television and film.

3. Street crime by youth which spills into the school.

4. Drug abuse.

5. Anonymity in the school and neighborhood.

6. A philosophy of self-serving expediency with little concern for others.

7. Sub-group solidarity with no allegiance to the larger society.

8. Contempt for the value of personal and public property.

9. Lethargic courts who take a simplistic view of school vandalism and let the perpetrators of such crimes go with a moral lecture, possibly probation, and release to teary-eyed parents who solemnly swear it won't happen again, while often "buying off" the student by reimbursement to the school for damages inflicted. The latter, of course, usually in the suburban rather than the urban setting.

10. The openness of schools in terms of student freedoms.

11. The pressure from all types of societal groups for what is called "student rights," often carried to the point of absurdity, with little or no emphasis upon responsibilities but only "rights."

12. Teacher apathy--with various association and union groups pushing the theory that the teacher is only responsible for what transpires in the classroom, leaving the responsibility for controlling misbehavior elsewhere entirely up to the administrators of the school.

13. Parental ignorance and/or indifference--allowing children to run the streets unchecked and unsupervised (37:56-57).

Critics claim that the cause of student unrest is only a reflection of the larger society and is thus outside the control of the school. Larson concluded, however, that although the high school should be a microcosm, a valid slice of the community life, community life in America today is not always worthy of imitation in a school. The secondary school principal cannot simply accept a duplication of everything as it actually is in the community to be encouraged in the school (9:39).

Vredevoe maintained that four major trends outside the school affect and create discipline problems within the school itself. These trends are summarized as: (1) the general breakdown in our society of agreement relative to moral and ethical standards and conduct, (2) the changing emphasis and attitude toward law enforcement, (3) the population explosion and the increasing mobility and concentration of people, and (4) the social revolution taking place within our society (15:19-20).

McKenna cited three major problems within the school as the bases of student unrest. These problems are: (1) dull and irrelevant curricular content and non-motivating teaching methods, (2) lack of broad involvement of students in the decision-making process, and (3) poor human relations between students and their instructors (40:54-60).

Howard and Jenkins agreed that many causes of student behavior problems are deeply rooted in the nature of the institution itself. Student behavior can best be modified if the organizational and psychological climate to which students react is modified. Procedures should be directed towards building, within the school, a more healthy organizational climate, rather than towards helping disruptive students adjust to a less healthy one (59:3). Howard and

Jenkins considered three main areas of the school environment: the belief and value system of the school, the school's communication system, and the manner in which decisions are made within the institution, with the conclusion that significant changes in these important components of the institution should do much to remedy the causes of discipline problems (59:14).

McPartland and McBill commented in their study that "while the main source of most serious offenses almost certainly lie in features of the broad society, we feel that schools can aggravate the problem or reduce it. . . ." They contended that the evidence they have examined leads them to the conclusion that schools can do something about the problem. Improving what they call "school responsiveness" can be expected "to have a measureable impact on reducing student crime" (80:9). Expressing a similar view, Murdock concluded that disruptive behavior breeds in impersonal schools just as crime proliferates in metropolitan areas where the absence of individual identity is found (42:89).

In _A Plan to Improve School and Library Environments_ causes of negative behavior were listed as follows:

> _Alienation_. An individual performs an act against the school for revenge against a teacher, principal, school, or society and its establishments in general.
>
> _Social Protest_. An individual feels that the building, fence, or other structure represents something counter to his beliefs. He may for example be opposed to compulsory education or certain school regulations.
>
> _Play_. An individual, having unfilled leisure time

with no suitable alternative recreation and lacking a sense of value for or ownership in the school or library, may find considerable amusement in trying his marksmanship skills against a few windows or lights, or he may feel an urge for literary expression on the school walls.

Values. An individual may lack a sense of ownership in and value of school and library properties which when combined with any of the above motives can easily lead to destructive acts.

Need and Greed. An individual may steal school or library property out of a need to obtain money to provide his basic or higher order necessities or simply because of the desire for more money.

Drugs. The use/abuse and sale of drugs support and motivate a large element of criminal activities in the community (64:14).

The same report noted the following additional causes set forth by Kiernan in his statement to the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency:

Lethargic Courts. "The actions of the courts are often delayed or equivocal, encouraging students to consider themselves beyond the law and causing a feeling of helplessness among the victims."

Openness of Schools. "One factor in the increased tide of violence and vandalism in the schools is the increased openness and lack of controls placed upon young people today. . . . A certain proportion of young people just have not been able to use their freedom constructively and positively."

Student Rights. "I want to strongly reaffirm our support of 'student rights' . . . but . . . such rights must be balanced by responsibilities . . . primary among them is to respect the rights of others."

Teacher Apathy. "A strong trend among teachers has developed to guide and direct students only in the classroom, leaving the responsibility for controlling behavior elsewhere entirely up to the 'administration'."

Parent Ignorance and/or Indifference. "One of the most appalling features of this nationwide problem is the lack of knowledge on the part of far too many

> parents as to the whereabouts of their children. . . . Allowing children to run the streets unchecked and unsupervised is the perfect formula for producing the irresponsible young citizen and potential vandal."
>
> Collateral Curriculum. "Students in school and out are taught by many curricula. . . . The opportunities for miseducation are burgeoning throughout society. We must all take seriously the fact that we are all taught by radio and television, peer groups and advertising agencies, and by magazines and museums" (64:14-15).

Weaver saw a marked change in the nature of the present youth culture that is influencing the direction of change in secondary education. He quoted Halleck as stating that:

> There are clear signs to indicate that the group of young people presently enrolled in our secondary schools are indeed different from past generations and that they are not likely to pass easily through the present phase thus permitting the secondary school to return to business as usual (16:51).

To support this contention, Weaver offered the following:

> 1. The leaders in the present high school subcultures are products of affluent and permissive home environments. Either they were treated by their parents as developing young citizens subject to a minimum of adult-imposed restrictions or they were manipulated into particular behavior patterns by their parents. Those treated by their parents as developing young adults resent many of the rules and regulations imposed by the school, while those manipulated by their parents recognize similar attempts by the school personnel to cajole them into acceptance of school policies and procedures. Such students prefer genuine treatment by school personnel and tend to resent further attempts at manipulation. Both groups are prominent in student leadership positions and are not interested in playing leadership games or in being "used" further by school authorities.
>
> 2. Another important characteristic of today's young people, also related to the affluent society in which they were raised, is their lack of specific

> vocational orientation and a general lack of concern for "making a living." During their lifetime there has been little need for concern for the provision of the basic economic necessities.
>
> 3. Because the present youth group has not been preoccupied with economic matters, it has concentrated its effort upon social concerns of the society. There is, consequently, an impatience with the older generation which still insists that economic concerns must take precedence over social problems. Young people of high school and college age are particularly intolerant of the curriculum which does not deal realistically with the social issues of our time.
>
> 4. Our young people live in what McLuhan has described as an "instantaneous electronic environment." Consequently, such events as the Viet Nam war, confrontations between police and demonstrators and high school and college riots and sit-ins are to the young viewer real and emotion-laden.
>
> 5. This "instantaneous electronic environment" provides a realistic communication link which makes it possible for the young person to join not only a national youth culture but an international one as well. A student demonstration in a high school anywhere in the world is viewed by young people via television in a matter of hours.
>
> 6. At the same time that the present youth group recognizes its tremendous potential for power, it is reminded in subtle ways that it has no legitimate means for exercising that power. Our youth are constantly reminded that educational decisions are made by those empowered to do so--namely, the adults to whom such power has been delegated. As a result, young people often resort to means of expressing their concerns which to adults seem irrelevant and irrational (16:51-52).

Cole, in a discussion on problems of school violence, acknowledged that children are, in fact, "different" today, particularly in terms of the nature of their acted-out behaviors. He stated:

> The surge of the recent "children's rights" movement has left in its wake a large group of youngsters who are well-versed in the covert protection afforded by recently enacted "children's rights" legislation. As a result, almost every

> community can become a child-adult adversary arena in which some children seem to delight in exploring and exploiting the legal strictures to which they can with impunity subject adults, both teachers and parents (25:58).

Many school officials are deeply concerned about new challenges that might be spurred by recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions upholding the right of students suspended from school to demand due-process hearings and to sue for damages. A lawyer for the American Civil Liberties Union commented that "officials will be less likely to resort to suspensions because now they will have to confront the student and give him a chance to defend himself, knowing that the courts can get involved" (49:38).

Hawaii's Public School System

In Honolulu, educational demands are similar to those of most large, rapidly growing areas. They have been made more complex, however, by the different social, economic, and family backgrounds of those coming to the schools.

In areas near military bases on the island of Oahu, Hawaii's public schools have faced problems similar to those of mainland communities near military establishments. However, in Hawaii, the number of students has been greater and the number of schools affected has been larger.

In the rural areas, teaching in small, isolated schools poses problems and challenges found in few mainland areas. These demands are made all the more complex by the fact that students often come from homes where English is not the language most often used, and where the development of verbal facility is limited and follows different patterns than elsewhere.

Hawaii is the ninth largest school district in the nation, and the only state which has a single statewide public school system. The Department of Education of the State of Hawaii is unique in that it is a state department of education, a large operating school district with 219 geographically separated schools, and a statewide public library system. Unlike most mainland local school districts, the Department of Education is a department of state government and does not have independent fiscal responsibility and authority. As a consequence, the Board of Education is not responsible for setting school tax rates and/or presenting a school budget for local voter approval.

The Department of Education has full authority and responsibility for the administration of the public schools, public libraries, and for the licensing and inspecting of private schools.

An executive board, known as the Board of Education, heads the Department of Education. The board formulates policy and exercises control over the public school system, the public schools, and the licensing and inspecting of private schools through its executive officer, the Superintendent of Education.

The Board of Education is a group of nine citizens elected by the voters of Hawaii to govern the public school system of the state. Seven of the members are elected to represent all the residents of Oahu, and two members are elected to represent the residents of Hawaii, Kauai and Maui counties. All representatives serve four-year terms.

All board meetings, except occasional executive sessions, are open to the public, and all members of the public are welcome and encouraged to participate. Official participants, in addition to members of the board, are the superintendent, representatives of the District School Advisory Councils and other special advisory councils, and the State Student Council president. Only board members have the right to vote.

The Superintendent of Education is the executive officer appointed by the board to carry out its policies, to be responsible for the day-to-day operations of the schools. The Superintendent also serves as secretary to the board. He performs all duties necessary to the proper conduct of the department, subject, however, to the approval of the board. He plans, organizes, staffs, directs and controls the educational program, finances, personnel and facilities of the department, bearing final responsibility to the board for the proper functioning of the department.

The State Office of Education includes the Superintendent of Education, the Deputy Superintendent, Assistant Superintendents and offices for Public Responsibility, Personnel Planning, and Departmental Planning and Budgeting, and Associate Superintendents and offices for State Librarian, Instructional Services and Support Services.

Seven District Superintendents are responsible to the State Superintendent, and they administer and supervise the programs of the department, except the public libraries, in all public schools within their district. There are four districts on the island of Oahu--the Honolulu School District (55 schools), the Central School District (38 schools), the Windward School District (29 schools), and the Leeward School District and Campbell Complex (31 schools). The District of Kauai on the island of Kauai includes the Waimea Complex (14 schools). The District of Maui includes the island of Maui and the Molokai Complex on the island of Molokai (23 schools). The District of Hawaii on the island of Hawaii includes the Kona Complex (29 schools).

The District Superintendent is the chief administrative officer in charge of all complexes and schools in the district to which he is assigned. He is responsible for the planning, organizing, staffing, directing and controlling of the educational programs, finances, personnel and facilities of his district. In each district there is a school advisory council which serves in an advisory capacity to the board, to the member of the board from his district, and to the District Superintendent.

The Department of Education has the largest budget of any state department. The Board of Education has the major responsibility for overseeing the formulation, review and presentation of the Department of Education's operating and capital improvement budgets, even though the board does not have authority to set tax rates, or the responsibility to defend its budget before the taxpayers. The State Legislature and the Department of Budget and Finance both expect the Board of Education to assume budget responsibility and perform effectively in budget review and control. The State Legislature must approve budget implementation. The Legislature may and has added programs to the education budget that the board has not recommended, and has failed to fund others the board has supported. After the Legislature adopts the Budget Act, it is then forwarded to the Governor. The Governor of Hawaii is solely responsible for releasing the funds to the Department of Education.

Discipline Problems in Hawaii

Kaser reported that student disruption and disrespect have increased noticeably in Hawaii's public schools and educators either cannot or will not do much about it. His interviews with teachers and administrators at several public high schools produced the following impressions:

> There is a hard core of chronically disruptive and disrespectful students in most public high schools. They usually constitute less than five percent of the student body but the damage and distraction they cause affects the whole school.
>
> Many teachers are reluctant to assume a "hard line" against the troublemakers because they feel the school administrators--specifically, the principals or vice principals who handle discipline--are too weak. Also, many teachers--especially women--do not want to risk vengeance from students.
>
> Some school administrators don't assume a hard line against troublemakers because there is constant pressure--from the police, from the Family Court and from the community--to keep such students off the streets and in class (74:3).

Kaser saw it this way:

> In short, parents and the public blame the school for being too permissive and for not maintaining order and discipline. Teachers blame their administrators for not being firm enough with troublesome students when a faculty member does report them and for not offering support when parents enter the dispute. And administrators blame parents for molding such kids in the first place and expecting the school to "straighten them out" (74:3).

"Violence in Schools," an editorial appearing in the Honolulu Advertiser, voiced the opinion that: (1) teachers are unwilling and unable to handle the kinds of criminal action that sometimes happen on campus; they are justifiably afraid that they won't be backed up by school managers, (2) there is no agreement as to what is and is not permissible behavior and language on campus, and (3) the Department of Education has no policy to deal with violence and vandalism (82:11).

Another editorial, "Schools and Discipline," cited the inconsistent and sometimes timid ways school administrators handle problem students in their schools as the cause for the lack of control in today's public high schools. The editorial pointed out that many school administrators fail to deal incisively with disruptive and disrespectful students. The article continued:

> There was a time in American education when school administrators dealt incisively--too incisively, and arbitrarily, today's courts would say--with problem students. There also was a time when students could not roam school corridors during class time; corridor monitors enforced that rule.
>
> Although the "good old days" were not all good in every instance, one cannot deny that today's public schools--especially at the intermediate and

> high school level--are not in control. Fire alarms are set off repeatedly, bulletin boards and posters are set on fire, firecrackers are almost a daily disruption. And "riding herd" on such problems is somewhat like trying to swat mosquitos with a sledgehammer (79:8).

The editorial noted that often students are caught in a disruptive or damaging act, reported to the office--and nothing happens. Principals are afraid to do anything because of the strict guidelines for suspending students from school. They do not want to get sued for doing the wrong thing, and neither do they want to be harassed by errant students themselves (79:8).

Ethnic diversity can be related to some pressing behavior problems in Island schools. There are obvious gaps in cultural awareness and understanding among students, teachers and parents. Sometimes conflict is covert, as in fighting and killing. Alienation is evident in absenteeism, dropouts and referrals for negative behavior (73:1).

Hawaii ranks first nationally in immigrant settlement in proportion to state population and this concentration has created special problems in the public schools. Numbers of immigrants from Asia continue to grow, which means continuing assimilation problems in the schools (73:1).

Addressing a conference in Honolulu on "Violence in the Schools," U.S. Senator Daniel Inouye began the proceedings with a brisk speech by saying:

> I realize that this touches but one aspect of the problem, but I hope that in some way it can

> serve a good purpose. If we can achieve a better understanding of these so-called problem groups--the Filipinos, the Samoans, the Vietnamese, and others--I feel certain that campus violence can be minimized (115).

Lieutenant Governor Nelson Doi noted that violence and vandalism is a complex problem involving all aspects of life in the community, and commented on the "indirect causes of evils in the larger community that must be treated." He remarked:

> Certainly there is good reason to believe that an attitude of alienation toward society among young people finds its roots off-campus. When transferred on-campus, this alienation is often expressed in the acts of violence that plague our schools. Surely there is little doubt that attitudes of racial prejudice learned from parents and friends outside of school create such racial antagonism as exists among our young people (115).

A University of Hawaii political science professor, Michael Haas, blamed ethnic enclaves as one cause of school violence. It was the consensus of the majority of the conference participants that one cause of violence was indeed due to racial tension (115).

Corporal Punishment

Jones observed that an organized and escalating movement to ban corporal punishment in the nation's schools is being met head-on by counter demands for tougher discipline procedures. Only three states, Maryland, Massachusetts, and New Jersey ban physical punishment in their schools. Fifteen of Maryland's twenty-four counties petitioned for exemption from the ban, and by early 1973 had been granted a free hand. Although forty-seven states permit corporal punishment, it has been banned by some local school boards, particularly in large cities. Thirteen states expressly provide for corporal punishment under law. Such laws range from Michigan's statute which allows any physical force necessary to maintain order, to Nevada's which discourages the use of force, but does not prohibit it. Other states, such as Florida, Hawaii, Montana, North Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont and Virginia, temper their laws by confining the force to "reasonable" punishment, or by involving principals or parents in the procedure. In California, Delaware, Pennsylvania and Texas, corporal punishment is permitted based on the doctrine of in loco parentis. This doctrine holds that the teacher or principal has the same rights and responsibilities that a prudent parent would have under the same circumstances (60:41-42).

According to Hamilton, the attitude of the courts is as follows:

> Assuming that corporal punishment is not prohibited by statute or regulation, the courts have said that a teacher is, within reasonable bounds, the substitute for the parent, exercising authority delegated to the teacher, and under such delegated authority may inflict corporal punishment upon the pupil (58:35-36).

Almost unanimously, courts have held that the teacher, acting in place of the parent, not only is justified in using reasonable physical punishment, but also is immune from civil or criminal liability for so doing. Only when punishment has been unreasonable or excessive, or inflicted maliciously, have teachers found themselves in legal trouble. However, Hamilton emphasized that from the purely legal point of view, even in states in which corporal punishment is permitted, a teacher who resorts to it assumes substantial legal risks. A teacher is bound, under the law, at least to:

> 1. Act from good motives, and not from anger or malice.
>
> 2. Inflict only moderate punishment.
>
> 3. Determine what the punishment is in proportion to the gravity of the offense.
>
> 4. Convince himself that the contemplated punishment is not excessive, taking into account the age, sex, size and physical strength of the pupil to be punished.
>
> 5. Assume the responsibility that the rule he seeks to enforce is reasonable (58:36).

Ovard defined the principal's responsibility as related to corporal punishment as follows:

> (1) to determine whether in his state it is legal or illegal to use corporal punishment, and (2) to convey this information and instructions to the teachers. If corporal punishment is legal within the state, the principal should instruct his teachers regarding the dangers involved if it is used, the relationship and decisions of the courts as related to corporal punishment, and the conditions under which a teacher would normally be held liable for the use of such punishment. As far as possible, both teachers and principals should find other satisfactory penalties that will accomplish the same result as corporal punishment (11:346).

Although the use of corporal punishment has been an established practice in schools, it is looked upon with general disfavor. In a move to abolish corporal punishment, an NEA-appointed task force toured the country in 1972, conducted hearings, and made recommendations on corporal punishment. It stated flatly: "The task force believes that teachers and other school personnel abhor physical violence of persons toward each other, no matter what the form--. . . ." Calling for an end to corporal punishment, the task force recommended that all states adopt a model statute outlawing corporal punishment in the schools, allowing reasonable physical restraint only to protect teachers and students from injury, to obtain possession of a weapon, or to protect property (60:42-43).

A similar study was made by another agency, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), which contended that physical punishment is not only ineffective and personally debilitating but also illegal. This study was even more blunt and to the point, with the contention that:

> The most important fact about violent bodily punishment is the high probability of its doing the victim an affirmative injury--psychological, educational or both. While the kind of injury may vary considerably, depending on the age and emotional condition of the victim, it is likely to be serious (60:44).

In attacking corporal punishment from a legal standpoint, the ACLU stated that since a public school is an instrument of the state, punishment meted out in the school "acquires the status of a government act and is, therefore, subject to the restraints of the Constitution." Further, the Constitution provides "that no one shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of the law," ACLU pointed out. "Implicit in these provisions," ACLU contended, "is the right to bodily integrity, the violation of which must be interpreted as a deprivation of liberty: (60:44-45).

The Ware v. Estes case in 1972 changed, at least for the time being, the traditional decisions of the nation's courts to generally uphold the use of corporal punishment. Attorneys for Ware, a Dallas high school student who had been spanked for being late for swimming practice, filed suit against Superintendent Estes, claiming that their client's rights guaranteed by the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments had been violated. The Court said:

> It is not within this Court's function, or individual competence, to pass judgment upon the merits of corporal punishment as an educational tool or a means of discipline. The wisdom of the policy is not the Court's concern. The only judgment made is that the evidence has not shown this policy to be arbitrary, capricious, unreasonable or wholly unrelated to the competency of the state in determining its educational policy. . . .
>
> While the School District here is certainly not compelled to use corporal punishment, they are allowed to use it by Texas Statute. Tex. Pen. Code Ann. Art. 1142 (1961) immunizes teachers from assault and battery charges in the exercise of the right of moderate restraint given by law to "the teacher over the scholar" as well as "to the parent over the child." This statute has been construed as authorizing the school teacher to inflict moderate corporal punishment upon a pupil. . . .
>
> The Court does not find that corporal punishment as authorized by the state law and the rules of the Dallas Independent School District amounts to cruel and unusual punishment. . . .
>
> In closing this opinion, the Court feels compelled to utter a general precept in light of the many cases it has had to entertain in the recent past embodying allegations of constitutional violations by the local school district. The following quote will succinctly and accurately describe the Court's attitude with respect to these cases.
>
> "Judicial interposition in the operation of the public school system of the Nation raises problems requiring care and restraint. . . . By and large, public education in our Nation is committed to the control of state and local authorities. Courts do

> not and cannot intervene in the resolution of conflicts which arise in the daily operation of school systems and which do not directly and sharply implicate basic constitutional values." Epperson v. Arkansas. . . . (112)

District Court Judge Taylor dismissed the case. The Fifth Circuit Court upheld Taylor and the Supreme Court, in refusing to hear the case, upheld the Circuit Court. Since no formal decision was made, only a refusal to review, the Supreme Court action does not set a national precedent. However, the action does represent a guideline for judicial decisions on corporal punishment in the future (53:27).

Although attempts have been made to have courts declare the use of corporal punishment in violation of the Eighth Amendment, which forbids cruel and unusual punishment, as yet, no court of record has declared the use of corporal punishment to be unconstitutional. The Supreme Court issued no written opinion in the case of Baker v. Owen but did affirm the three-judge federal court's decision, refused the argument that corporal punishment is in violation of the Eighth Amendment per se, and held that the use of corporal punishment was not an unconstitutional interference with the rights of parents to determine disciplinary measures for their children. It would appear that the Supreme Court also supported the lower court's position that corporal punishment must be administered under the same general rules of due process as other means of school discipline. This was spelled out in some detail, including the requirements of notice, oral explanation of reasons for punishment prior to its administration, and a subsequent written explanation to parents if it is requested (53:27-28).

Berger emphasized that efforts should be made to create a more humanistic learning environment. He declared that there should be an end to repressive discipline procedures, especially corporal punishment, stating that such punishment dehumanizes the relationships between students and teachers and between students and administrators. Admitting that his view does not reflect either public or educational opinion at this time, Berger conceded that most people believe that if teachers and administrators were more strict there will be produced a generation of young people who will respect laws and rules as a result of this training (54:25-26).

Legal Considerations

Because of the relatively new emphasis in secondary education on student rights and due process of law, knowledge of court decisions is essential. The school administrator, now charged with the responsibility of insuring that the school reflects the trend and spirit of recent court rulings is obligated to incorporate student rights within an orderly school climate.

Until the landmark Tinker decision, the courts most often adopted the concept of "reasonableness" as the standard for measuring the constitutionality of a school rule or an educational practice. If the school rule could not be shown by the plaintiff as being "arbitrary, capricious or unreasonable," the courts would not interfere, and the matter would be left to the educational judgment and discretion of the school authorities (85).

The classical view of the courts with regards to student rights was set forth in Pugsley v. Sellmeyer. The court said:

> The educational interests and school affairs in each school district in the State are placed by statute under the control and management of the school directors, and . . . to effectively exercise this authority a broad discretion must be accorded them . . . while their authority is not without limit . . . courts will not interfere in matters of detail and government of schools, unless the officers refuse to perform a clear, plain duty, or unless they unreasonably and arbitrarily exercise the discretionary authority conferred upon them (102).

The courts did not consider whether the regulations were wise or expedient, but merely whether they were a reasonable exercise of the power and discretion of the school authorities. The point was often made that education is a state matter, and the courts have more important duties than to participate and/or interfere in the management of the schools.

An example of the dichotomy between student conduct that school officials may prohibit and student conduct that must be permitted is shown in two cases decided by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

In Burnside v. Byars the court held that wearing buttons bearing the words "One Man One Vote" and "SNCC" which did not appear to hamper the school from carrying out its regularly scheduled activities was protected as a right of free expression under the First Amendment. Ruling against the school officials since there was insufficient evidence to support the claim that wearing freedom buttons caused disruption and interference with the educational process, Judge Gewin stated:

> The establishment of an educational program requires the formulation of rules and regulations necessary for the maintenance of an orderly program of classroom learning. In formulating regulations, including those pertaining to the discipline of school children, school officials have a wide latitude of discretion. But the school is always bound by the requirements that the rules and regulations must be reasonable. . . .
>
> . . . we must also emphasize that school officials cannot ignore expressions of feelings with which they do not wish to contend. They cannot infringe on the students' right to free and unrestricted expression as guaranteed to them under the First Amendment to the Constitution, where the exercise of such rights in the school buildings and classrooms do not materially and substantially interfere with the requirements of appropriate discipline in the operation of the school (87).

The same court in another case, Blackwell v. Issaquena County Board of Education, found that a principal's decision to forbid the wearing of buttons that showed a black hand and a white hand joined together and the word "SNCC" was reasonable because the wearing of the buttons created an "unusual degree of commotion, boisterous conduct, a collision with the rights of others, an undermining of authority, and a lack of order, discipline and decorum." As the court stated:

> It is always within the province of school authorities to provide by regulation and prohibition and punishment of acts calculated to undermine the school routine. This is not only proper in our opinion but is necessary (86).

In his decision, Judge Gewin compared the circumstances in the Burnside and Blackwell cases to make his judgment clearly understood:

> In the case now before us, the affidavits and testimony from the District Court present quite a different picture from the record in Burnside. . . . Here the District Court was presented with evidence of numerous instances, which have been set out in the statement of facts, where students conducted themselves in a disorderly manner, disrupted classroom procedure, interfered with the proper decorum and discipline of the school and disturbed other students who did not wish to participate in the wearing of the buttons. Despite the factual differences in the two cases, the question we must decide remains the same. Is the regulation forbidding the wearing of freedom buttons by school children reasonable? A reasonable regulation is one which is "essential in maintaining order and discipline on school property" and "which measurably contributes to the maintenance of order and decorum within the educational system." . . .
>
> The facts demonstrate that during the time students wore freedom buttons to school, much disturbance was created by these students. Their actions in the school building are indeed reprehensible and school officials certainly have the authority to mete out punishment as they deem appropriate for their disregard for the orderly progression of classroom instruction, and their complete disregard for the rights of their fellow students. The record clearly indicates that these actions by the students . . . constituted a complete breakdown in school discipline (86).

As a result of the clear, substantial evidence of disruption, Judge Gewin declared that "in these circumstances we consider the rule of the school authorities reasonable." At the same time, he warned school officials to be careful in "their monitoring of student expression in circumstances in which such expression does not substantially interfere with the operation of the school" (86).

Brothers determined that the landmark Gault case in 1967 stamped judicial approval on the movement to grant more constitutional rights to young people (22:3). The Supreme Court stated in this case: "Whatever may be their precise impact, neither the Fourteenth Amendment nor the Bill of Rights is for adults alone" (97).

The single case that most revolutionized law in the secondary schools, however, was the landmark decision in 1969 in Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District. Justice Fortas, delivering the opinion of the Court, recognized that while school officials must have broad discretion in establishing and maintaining order and discipline, school officials do not possess absolute authority over students. In ruling in favor of the student, the court had this to say:

> . . . this case does not concern speech or action that intrudes upon the work of the schools or the rights of other students.
>
> . . . there is no indication that the work of the schools or any class was disrupted. Outside the classrooms, a few students made hostile remarks . . . but there were no threats or acts of violence on school premises.
>
> . . . Any departure from absolute regimentation may cause trouble. Any variation from the majority's opinion may inspire fear. Any word spoken, in class, in lunchroom or on the campus, that deviates from the views of another person may start an argument or cause a disturbance. But our Constitution says we must take this risk. . . .
>
> In order for the State in the person of school officials to justify prohibition of a particular expression of opinion, it must be able to show that its action was caused by something more than a mere desire to avoid the discomfort and unpleasantness that always accompany an unpopular viewpoint. Certainly where there is no finding and no showing that engaging in the forbidden conduct would "materially and substantially interfere with the requirements of appropriate discipline in the operation of the school," the prohibition cannot be sustained (111).

Justice Fortas repeatedly stated that a student's freedom of speech can be restrained only when the student's conduct materially and substantially interferes with the maintenance of appropriate discipline (111). Since in the Tinker case no disturbances or disorders occurred, the Constitution does not permit denial of this type of student expression.

In the past the burden of proof rested with the student attacking the "reasonableness" of the school rule. In Tinker the burden of proof was shifted to the school authorities who must now justify their actions by showing that the prohibitions they impose on freedom of expression are necessary because of conduct that interferes materially and substantially with school operations.

The aftermath of Tinker saw constitutional attacks in federal and state courts on school rules that restricted freedom of expression.

In Aguirre v. Tahoka Independent School District, the court did not find that disruption occurred as the result of Mexican-American students wearing brown armbands to express dissatisfaction with school policies and practices. Since the factual situation in the case was similar to Tinker, the district court stated that decision controlled (84).

In a Colorado case, Hernandez v. School District Number One, students of Mexican descent were suspended when they persisted in wearing black berets as a symbol of their Mexican culture, an expression of unity, a symbol of respect, and a symbol of dissatisfaction with society's treatment of Mexican-Americans. Upholding the school administration's action in this case, the court cited several instances of disruption caused by wearers of black berets. This included shouts of "Chicano Power," blocking the passage of other students, causing a disturbance in the lunchroom and engaging in general insubordination (96).

A Texas school regulation stating that "any student who participates in a boycott, sit-in, stand-in, walk-out, or other related forms of distraction . . . shall by his action be subject to automatic suspension from school" was held in _Dunn_ v. _Tyler Independent School District_ to be constitutionally overbroad because it arbitrarily prohibited all such demonstrations without limiting itself to those which cause "material and substantial disruption of the educational environment" (90).

The courts could generally be depended on to uphold school rules until _Tinker_ made it clear that _in loco parentis_ must yield to the broader concept of the constitutional rights of the individual, regardless of age. Schwartz contended that _in loco_, its origins traceable to the Code of Hammurabi in the 18th century B.C. and imported to this country as part of the common law, always has been too broadly interpreted. Recent court rulings, Schwartz suggested, have not so much curtailed the concept as they have drawn attention to its narrowness and inapplicability to student rights (61:4).

Notably, over a century ago, a state court indicated it had some misgivings in completely accepting the in loco principle. The court declared in Lander v. Seaver:

> From the intimacy and nature of the relation, and the necessary character of family government, the law suffers no intrusion upon the authority of the parent, and the privacy of domestic life, unless in extreme cases of cruelty and injustice. This parental power is little liable to abuse, for it is continually restrained by natural affection, the tenderness which the parent feels for his offspring. The schoolmaster has no such natural restraint. Hence he may not safely be entrusted with all a parent's authority (98).

The classic statement frequently quoted by the courts as the basis for judging student-school relations was delivered by Justice Jackson of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1943 in West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette:

> The Fourteenth Amendment, as now applied to the States, protects the citizen against the State itself and all of its creatures--Boards of Education not excepted. These have, of course, important, delicate, and highly discretionary functions, but none that they may not perform within the limits of the Bill of Rights. That they are educating the young for citizenship is reason for scrupulous protection of Constitutional freedoms of the individual, if we are not to strangle the free mind at its source and teach youth to discount important principles of our government as mere platitudes (113).

Subsequent to the Barnette decision, courts have more carefully considered the application of constitutional rights to students and have examined cases more diligently in these terms. However, the results have not been consistent.

Johnson observed that no other question posed by the student rights movement has generated the intense emotion or resulted in such extensive litigation as that of long hair on high school boys:

> Students and their attorneys have variously urged that the constitutional right to long hair is located in the freedom-of-speech provision of the First Amendment, in the Third Amendment, in the privacy protections of the Fourth Amendment, in the right to pursue a profession protected by the Fifth Amendment, in the prohibition against cruel and unusual punishments in the Eighth Amendment, in the Ninth Amendment, in the Tenth Amendment, or in the equal-protection of due-process clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment. In some cases, an attempt has been made to combine some or all of these constitutional provisions in the apparent belief that the combination may afford the desired protection even if the individual amendments do not (38:24).

However, he noted the opinions in these cases have served to suggest at best an ambiguous right for the student (38:25).

In Leonard v. School Committee in Attleboro a school regulation forbidding extreme haircuts was held to be valid and within the school board's jurisdiction (99). However, a California case, Myers v. Arcata Union High School District, held to the contrary, that hair styles are a form of self-expression and protected under the First Amendment. Regarding school rules, Judge Watson said in Myers:

> The limits within which regulations can be made by the school are that there be some reasonable connection to school matters, deportment, discipline, etc., or to the health and safety of the students. . . . They must reasonably pertain to the health and safety of the students or to the orderly conduct of school business. In this regard, consideration should be given to what is really health and safety . . . and what is merely personal preference (100).

The court's position that disciplinary action by school authorities should be based on whether the condition creates a disruption in the educational process is clearly evident in Davis v. Ferment. The court upheld the hair rule on the following grounds:

> If a particular type of conduct has the effect of disrupting the learning atmosphere, it should be subject to regulation. In Ferrell v. Dallas Independent School District (261 F.Supp. 545) in 1966 the court said, "If a student's dress is lewd or his appearance is a studied effort to draw attention to himself, his presence is disruptive--such behavior is no different than verbal rudeness" (89).

In Richards v. Thurston the court found that the right of students to determine their personal appearance "implicit in the 'liberty' assurance of the Due Process Clause." The court commented:

> Yet, liberty seems to us an unquestionable protection if it encompasses only the right to do momentous acts, leaving the state free to interfere with those personal aspects of our lives which have no direct bearing on the ability of students to enjoy their liberty. . . .
>
> Indeed, a narrower view of liberty in a free society might, among other things, allow a state to require a conventional coiffeur of all its citizens, a governmental power not unknown in European history. . . .
>
> The Founding Fathers wrote an amendment for speech and assembly; even they did not deem it necessary to write an amendment for personal appearance. We conclude that within the commodious concept of liberty, embracing freedoms great and small, is the right to wear one's hair as he wishes (104).

Further, the court said:

> No factual foundation has been offered to show that plaintiff's hair style involves a health or sanitary risk to him or others, or will interfere with plaintiff's or with others' performance of their school work, or will create disciplinary problems of a kind reasonably thought to be a concern of public officials (104).

The Fifth Circuit's decisions in sustaining school codes regulating hair have turned on the reasonableness and necessity of the regulations. Two district courts in this circuit have upheld hair regulations against constitutional challenges. In Carter v. Hodges (88) and Giangreco v. Center School District (94) the courts proceeded from the premise that the state carries the burden of demonstrating the reasonableness of the regulation. And, in both cases, the courts found that the students' appearance had, in fact, caused school disruptions.

According to Anderson and Van Dyke the main point of the court decisions is that the schools do have a right to enforce student dress and grooming regulations, providing there is factual evidence that the mode of appearance being regulated disrupts the effective and efficient maintenance of the educational program of the school. These legal decisions suggest the recommendation that rules on dress and grooming be stated in general rather than detailed terms, e.g., "Dress and grooming shall be appropriate to the maintenance of an efficient and effective educational program, and shall not endanger the health and safety of students." Such a statement provides an adequate basis for controlling disruptions related to inappropriate dress and grooming and eliminates the trauma of dealing with the differences in moral judgments among students, parents, and teachers on these matters (1:370).

In the area of student rights, administrators tend to be opposed to freedom of written expression in school newspapers. However, the direction of court opinion is toward broadening high school students' rights to publish and distribute their views. When censorship of school papers is challenged, the burden is increasingly on school authorities to prove that unfettered freedom of expression will lead to substantial disorder in the school or to infringement on the rights of others.

Scoville v. Board of Education discussed the question of students' expulsions for publishing and distributing a newspaper called "Grass High." In 1970 the Court of Appeals relied on Tinker, ruling that the underground newspaper editors could not be penalized unless their activities led school authorities to "reasonably . . . forecast substantial disruption of or material interference with school activities" (108).

Prior to Tinker, the court upheld the board's action, stating that the editors' actions "amounted to an immediate advocacy of, and incitement to, disregard of school administrative procedures" and that distribution of "Grass High" was a substantial threat to the effective operation of Central High (106).

After the Tinker decision, a three-judge panel of a U.S. Court of Appeals upheld the district court decision (107). However, when the entire U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit ruled on the case, it reversed the previous decisions. The Court of Appeals stated that the district court had no factual basis on which it could forecast disruption or interference. When school rules infringe on freedom of expression, the court pointed out that it is the school officials who have the burden of justifying them (108).

In Sullivan v. Houston Independent School District, the district court overruled school authorities who had suspended two high school underground journalists for distributing a newspaper critical of the school system. The court stated that students have the right to produce and distribute newspapers on and off campus as long as they do not substantially disrupt school operations. The court said:

> It is also clear that if a student complies with reasonable rules as to times and places for distributing within the school and does so in an orderly, nondisruptive manner, then he should not suffer if other students, who are lacking in self-control, tend to overreact, thereby becoming a disruptive influence (110).

In Schwartz v. Schuker the courts upheld the expulsion of a student who distributed a paper containing filthy references, abusive language, and nihilistic propaganda. The court stated: "True freedom of speech is not an absolute and is subject to constitutional restrictions for the protection of the social interest in government, order and morality" (105).

Whether a student newspaper could be distributed in a public high school without first being submitted to the school administration for approval of its contents was the issue in Eisner v. Stamford Board of Education. Students contended that advance approval of the contents of the "independent mimeographed newspaper" called the "Stamford

Free Press" was constitutionally prohibited "prior restraint" on expression. The district court agreed:

> The Board of Education has the duty under Connecticut law, and the right under Tinker, to punish conduct by the student, in class or out of it, which for any reason--whether it stems from time, place, or type of behavior--materially disrupts classwork or involves substantial disorder or invasion of the rights of others. But this right and duty does not include blanket prior restraint; the risk taken if a few abuse their First Amendment rights of free speech and press is outweighed by the far greater risk run by suppressing free speech and press among the young (91).

The U.S. Court of Appeals upheld the district court's ruling, but also upheld the authority of the school officials to require students to obtain prior approval to distribute publications if the school's rules contain safeguards for student rights. However, the court ruled that schools should require prior submission "only when there is to be a substantial distribution of written material, so that it can reasonably be anticipated . . . that the distribution would disrupt school operations" (92).

Court decisions on prior restraint of student expression in high schools are not always consistent. The courts in Quarterman v. Byrd (103) and Shanley v. Northeast Independent School District (106) agreed with the decision in Eisner. However, in Fujishima v. Board of Education the court disagreed, calling Eisner "unsound constitutional law" (93).

In Fujishima students were suspended for distributing an underground newspaper and anti-Vietnam war leaflets under the authority of section 6-19 of the rules of the Chicago Board of Education that reads:

> No person shall be permitted . . . to distribute on the school premises any books, tracts, or other publications, . . . unless the same shall have been approved by the General Superintendent of Schools.

The court declared 6-19 "unconstitutional as a prior restraint in violation of the First Amendment." Although the court enjoined school officials from enforcing section 6-19, it was noted:

> Such injunction will not prevent defendants from promulgating reasonable, specific regulations setting forth the time, manner and place in which the distribution of written materials may occur. . . . The board may then punish students who violate those regulations. Of course, the board may also establish a rule punishing students who publish and distribute on school grounds obscene or libelous literature (93).

The Tinker decision established the standards by which actions of school authorities must be measured. Public high school students "have a right to freedom of speech that is not shed at the schoolhouse gate" (111). However, it is equally clear that the daily administration of "public schools is committed to school officials." When a conflict arises between Constitutional rights and good-faith actions by school officials, the Tinker holding provides that students' rights to free speech may not be abridged in the absence of "facts which might reasonably have led school authorities to forecast substantial disruption of or material interference with school activities" (111). Administrators may no longer require students to desist in activities which fall under the classification of freedom of expression merely because those activities materially and substantially disrupt the operation of the school.

Harvard's Center for Law and Education suggested that "punishment for something a student has said, written, published or distributed should be viewed with strictest scrutiny." Hudgins agreed:

> Student actions--especially those covered by the First Amendment, freedom of speech, the press and so on--appear to be becoming increasingly untouchable by any school board that wants to avoid landing in court.

This student freedom extends to the right to take stands on major current issues and to publish material that may not be to their elders' liking, Hudgins said, but not to abusing the educators themselves, to encouraging disobedience to school authority, or to unrestricted distribution of unofficial or "underground" publications (61:20).

Surveys by Education U.S.A. found that a majority of school administrators disclaim requiring "prior review" of student publications, while acknowledging that faculty advisors frequently do preview student publishing efforts. There was a wide range of comment from local administrators on the extent of student freedom to publish in their schools. It ranged from a Virginia report that said, "What the principal says is what is printed" to broad declarations of student freedoms. A high school in Illinois lists various forms of expression--printed and symbolic--as "protected activities" which the school administration will not restrict, except under "general limitations" that deal with disruptions, breaches of discipline, invasion of the rights of others, and avoidance of obscenities or libelous matter (61:22).

Thorum observed that the last stronghold of *in loco parentis* doctrine remains in the search and seizure aspect of student rights. Based upon the interpretation of the courts that lockers are public and not private property, school officials have reserved the right to search property in the school, even though it has been assigned to students (47:12). In *People* v. *Overton*, Judge Keating observed: "Not only have the school authorities the right to inspect but *this right becomes a duty when suspicion arises* that something of an illegal nature may be secreted there" (101).

Olson emphasized that what is prohibited is not searches and seizures but "unreasonable" searches and seizures; reasonableness must be determined in terms of the school context (43:47). He felt that it is safe to say that a search by a responsible school officer of a student's locker is lawful if the following four circumstances exist:

> 1. The search is based on reasonable grounds for believing that something contrary to school rules or significantly detrimental to the school and its students will be found in that locker.
>
> 2. The information leading to the search and the seizure are independent of the police.
>
> 3. The primary purpose of the search is to secure evidence of student misconduct for school disciplinary purposes, although it may be

> contemplated that in appropriate circumstances the evidence would also be made available to the police. If evidence of a crime or grounds for a juvenile proceeding is lawfully obtained by school personnel, it may be turned over to the police and used by them.
>
> 4. The school has keys or combinations to the lockers and the students are on some form of prior notice that the school reserves the right to search the lockers (43:49-50).

Harvard's Center for Law and Education submitted that courts have tended toward the opinion that lockers belong to the school, not to the student, and therefore: "Until decisions like this are reversed in the higher courts, students would be wise to treat their lockers as public, rather than private, places." Hudgins advised that necessary searches be conducted by principals. "Sound law requires that the student be present," he pointed out, "and similarly, it's wise for the administrator to have a third party present as a witness." Further, the student should be warned of the impending search, but only enroute to the locker so that its contents cannot be removed or destroyed (61:24). Equally cautious, Ackerly advised principals against "any such searching except under extreme circumstances, unless permission to do so has been freely given by the student, the student is present, and other competent witnesses are at hand" (52:12).

The issue of procedural due process and the rights of students was addressed in Goss v. Lopez. The Supreme Court, recognizing that education may be a property right of students, had this to say:

> Having chosen to extend the right to an education to people of appellees' class generally, Ohio may not withdraw that right on the grounds of misconduct absent fundamentally fair procedures to determine whether the misconduct has actually occurred.
>
> Among other things, the state is constrained to recognize a student's legitimate entitlement to a public education as a property interest which is protected by the Due Process Clause and which may not be taken away for misconduct, without adherence to the minimum procedures required by that clause (95).

The Court held that any suspension of a student, even one of 10 days or less, entitled the student to due process of law translated as being some kind of informal hearing. The Court did not establish procedures for suspensions and expulsions, it required only "some kind of notice and some kind of hearing." For short suspensions of 10 days or less, the Goss decision outlined the following requirements:

1. The student should be given oral or written notice of the charges against him.

2. If the student denies the charges, he is entitled to an explanation of the evidence the school has as a basis of the charge.

3. The student shall have an opportunity to tell his side of the story.

4. There need be no delay between the time notice is given and the time of the hearing. In a majority of cases the principal may informally discuss the alleged misconduct with the student minutes after it has occurred.

5. Since the hearings may occur almost immediately following the misconduct, generally the notice and hearing shall precede the suspension.

6. In cases where the presence of the student poses a continuing danger to persons or property of an ongoing threat of disrupting the academic process, the student may be immediately removed from school. In such cases, the notice and hearing

should follow as soon as practicable (50:71).

Many states have outlined such requirements in their statutes. Such is the case of Rule 21 signed into law on 21 April 1976 by George Ariyoshi, Governor of the State of Hawaii. Rule 21 sets forth definitions of "dismissal," "suspension," "crisis suspension," "disciplinary transfer," and "serious discipline," discusses prohibited behavior and disciplinary rules, and spells out procedures, including investigation, initiation of proceedings, and notice and its contents; the conduct of hearings, and appeal procedures (63).

The requirements imposed upon administrators under the holding in Goss are minimal. The Court, aware of the concern of educators about the limitation it was placing upon their exercise of disciplinary authority, believed that it had exercised restraint:

> In holding as we do, we do not believe that we have imposed procedures on school disciplinarians which are inappropriate in a classroom setting. Instead we have imposed requirements which are, if anything, less than a fair-minded school principal would impose upon himself in order to avoid unfair suspensions. . . .
>
> We stop short of construing the Due Process Clause to require, country-wide, that hearings in short suspensions must afford the students the opportunity to secure counsel, to confront and cross-examine witnesses supporting the charge or to call his own witnesses to verify his own version of the incident. Brief disciplinary suspensions are almost countless. To impose in each case even truncated trial type procedures might well overwhelm administrative facilities in many places and by diverting resources, cost more than it would save in educational effectiveness. Moreover, further formalizing the suspension process and escalating its formality and adversary nature may not only

> make it too costly as a regular disciplinary tool but also destroy its effectiveness as part of the teaching process (95).

In Wood v. Strickland the Supreme Court ruled that a school official could be liable for damages "if he knew or reasonably should have known that the action he took within his sphere of official responsibility would violate the constitutional rights of the student affected." In establishing personal liability under Wood, the Court emphasized that educators are in fact bound to abide by constitutional law, not just educational policy (114).

Clearly establishing a new benchmark, Wood required that the educator act in "good faith" and defined good faith as knowing, within the bounds of reasonableness, a student's constitutional rights. The Court indicated that school officials "need not exercise their discretion with undue timidity" and concluded:

> A compensatory award will be appropriate only if the school board member has acted with such an impermissible motivation or with such disregard of the student's clearly established constitutional rights that his actions cannot reasonably be characterized as being in good faith (114).

Anson commented that the Goss and Wood decisions stand for the idea of fair and responsible treatment of students in disciplinary actions. The practical effect of these decisions may be to make administrators more aware of the fairness of the procedures used in suspension cases. However, some educators feel that these decisions spell the end of the administrator's almost total control over the disciplinary process (21:17).

Von Brock was convinced that the Supreme Court has not deprived the school administrator of his authority regarding student discipline. His belief was that the Goss and Wood decisions provide no evidence that a fair-minded, informed principal should be handicapped in the orderly operation of the school (50:76).

Implications for Principals

Educators have claimed that student rights have been extended liberally, but corresponding responsibilities have not been assumed by youth or demanded by society. Some critics have charged that the attitude of parents, teachers and administrators is leaning toward more permissiveness and, at the same time, toward less responsibility for what used to be considered the duties of parent, teacher or administrator.

According to Ackerly, the high school principal, being a highly visible and influential figure in the administrative structure of the school, has characteristically found himself at the point where the often conflicting wishes and ambitions of students, teachers, and parents collide with overall school administration policy. The efforts of school officials to cope with real or anticipated disruptions have resulted in a considerable number of court cases in which the authority of the school to control student conduct is challenged. Recent court decisions have tended in the direction of restraining the school from exercising many of the forms of control over student conduct formerly accepted as normal and proper. These decisions have indicated in more explicit terms the constitutional limits of the school's powers over the student as an individual. The impact of court decisions relating to the control of student behavior is felt more immediately and heavily by the principal than by anyone else in the administrative or teaching hierarchy (52:1-2). Thus, due process is an important issue that must be considered by all administrators.

Ackerly emphasized that the principal, representing authority in the school, must be careful to ensure due process to students. The limits of authority or the exercise of personal rights and privileges has inherent in it the problem of procedure: procedure in bringing the subject up for discussion; procedure in airing the views of the people involved; and the procedure in reaching a decision as to the action to be taken. The underlying concept, understood by most Americans, is one of fairness--a fair hearing, a fair trial, a fair judgment (52:3).

Necessary considerations to administrative proceedings in schools are as follows: (1) The accused must have personal knowledge of any charges against him that endanger his freedom, his status or his property. (2) He must have an opportunity to be heard and to controvert the evidence or the witnesses against him. (3) He must be given the opportunity to show that the rules or laws being applied to him are demonstrably unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious, discriminatory, or too vague to be understood, and therefore, unenforceable (52:3-4).

Clearly spelling out appropriate procedure for applying due process in the school situation, Ackerly stated:

> Serious breaches of discipline or an accumulation of minor breaches must be handled with due process. Because it is now well established that students enjoy the protection of the Fourteenth Amendment, a number of procedural matters must be considered. Rules governing hearings should be formulated by the faculty and the student government representatives and should be published.
>
> A notice of the time and place of the hearing and of the exact nature of the charge must be given to the student a reasonable time in advance. The hearing might be held by a panel. For example, two students and two faculty members could be selected by lot, and a fifth member be appointed by the principal. Student panelists selected by the school administration are not usually respected by the student body. Selecting a panel by lot approaches the jury system and should obviate charges of discrimination. In all cases the accused must be allowed to be represented by someone of his own choosing. The hearings may be informal, though it need not be open; and the accused must be allowed to cross-examine witnesses and to present witnesses in his own behalf. The student's parents or guardian may attend. The panel should be instructed to make findings of fact and submit these together with its recommendations to the principal promptly after the close of the hearing. The principal and, subsequently, the board of education should be guided by the report and the practical recommendations of the panel. Also, if the accused believes he was not accorded a fair hearing, he must be allowed to appeal on this ground; any other plan of action may result in school authorities being brought into court (52:15).

Anderson and Van Dyke noted that traditionally, high school principals have exercised considerable authority in dealing with students who have committed major offenses against the school. In many cases, the student had no recourse to judgments by the principal. Undoubtedly, there have been cases of injustice under a system which allowed a single person so much power with no established avenue for challenging his judgment (1:377-78).

Historically, courts have been reluctant to interfere with the principal's control of students in secondary schools. However, there has been a growing court trend in recent years to broaden student rights under the Constitution. The U.S. Supreme Court is making clear by its decisions the obligation school officials have to afford the protection of the Bill of Rights and of the Fourteenth Amendment to all with whom they deal, regardless of age (52:5).

George pointed out that the _In re Gault_ decision (97) effectively granted to juveniles "constitutional guaranties of due process" in judicial proceedings heretofore reserved for adults (32:120). Amplifying this point, Anderson and Van Dyke noted that a major change in the relationship of the student to the authority of the principal over his welfare came about as a result of the _Gault_ decision. The application of this decision has received considerable attention by school administrators. Although due process takes time and is fairly cumbersome, the principal has the obligation to administer all rules and regulations in such a way as to assure all students fair treatment. The time invested is justified by the fact that with due process individuals are accorded justice through the rule of law rather than through the rule of personality (1:378-79).

Ackerly and Gluckman presented what they consider, for principals, defensible positions or guides to action on issues that may arise in secondary schools. In summary these are:

> 1. Freedom of Expression Generally. Freedom of expression cannot legally be restricted unless its exercise can reasonably be expected to interfere with the orderly conduct of classes and school work.
>
> 2. Student Publications. School-sponsored publications should be free from policy restrictions outside of the normal rules for responsible journalism.
>
> 3. Personal Appearance. There should be no restriction on student's hair style or his manner of dressing unless they present a "clear and present" danger to the student's health and safety, cause an interference with work, create classroom or school disorder, or damage school property.
>
> 4. Religion and Patriotism. The First Amendment forbids any governmental authority to take actions that either aid the "establishment of religion" or "prohibit the free exercise thereof." Also, patriotic rituals, though not referred to in the Bill of Rights, have been viewed critically by the courts, particularly if partcipation is required of all students.
>
> 5. Civil Rights. There are now very few circumstances in which distinctions between school pupils on the basis of sex or marital status will be sustained by the courts.
>
> 6. Codes of Behavior. The authority of school officials to comprehensively prescribe and control conduct in the schools has been affirmed repeatedly by the courts. The rules, however, must be concerned with speech or actions that disrupt the work of the school or the rights of other students.
>
> 7. Student Property. A student's locker and desk should not be opened for inspection except when approved by the principal because he has reasonable cause to believe that prohibited articles are stored therein. If inspection takes place, the

student should be present, if possible.

8. Weapons and Drugs. Students possessing or using on school premises weapons or drugs prohibited by law should be reported promptly to the appropriate law enforcement officials.

9. Extracurricular Activities. In every American secondary school, students are encouraged to form clubs and other groups that will enrich and extend their educational experiences. Most schools have formalized and published procedures governing the creation and operation of such organizations, but we recommend that these procedures be reviewed.

10. Discipline. We recommend that rules governing in-school discipline be established only after full participation of students and other concerned parties.

11. Corporal Punishment. Corporal punishment must be administered under the same general rules of due process as other means of school discipline.

12. Student Participation in School Governance. Whether it is called a student council, student senate, or some other name, the scope of its powers, privileges, and responsibilities should be a matter of public record.

13. The Right to Petition. Students should be allowed to present petitions to the administration at any time.

14. Student Records. School districts should issue specific instructions governing the maintenance and release of school records to all school administrators (53:8-30).

Cuban suggested that a useful approach to student rights is the planning of Student Bill of Rights proposals. A number of them have been advanced by students in several states, often with the cooperation of the American Civil Liberties Union. They are part of an attempt to establish an operative definition of student liberties, rights, and responsibilities (56:45).

Kleeman amplified this approach, contending that there is an urgent need for written codes of student rights and responsibilities. Reasons advanced for such codes are to establish new rights for students or to impose new restrictions on them, to spell out their "due process" or to replace an "unwritten code." Kleeman quoted from a statement on student rights and responsibilities of the Seattle Board of Education:

> The Seattle School District recognizes that the primary intent of society in establishing the public schools is to provide an opportunity for learning; that the students have full rights of citizenship as delineated in the United States Constitution and its amendments; that citizenship rights must not be abridged, obstructed or in other ways altered except in accordance with due process of law; and that education is one of these citizenship rights (61:10).

He also quoted the New York City Board of Education that prefaced its high school student rights and responsibilities statement with a stern caution:

> The rights and responsibilities set forth in no way diminish the legal authority of school officials and the board of education to deal with disruptive students. The statement is meant to foster greater understanding so that all concerned can participate more effectively in an active educational partnership (61:11).

An Education U.S.A. 1972 survey of state departments of education undertaken to determine where the states stand on certain questions pertaining to student rights and responsibilities shows fifteen states reported that they have adopted statements on student rights and responsibilities; others reported having such a step under consideration. In most of the states that have issued statments, students played a part in their preparation. At least half the states reported that students are concerned about civil liberties as well as student participation on boards of education or through advisory councils (61:12).

Kleeman stressed that the concern with expanding and spelling out student rights carries with it the concomitant exercise of responsibility. However, regarding "what kind" of responsibility is incumbent on students, views diverge considerably. San Francisco's student rights and responsibilities manual stated:

> Students have the responsibility to respect the rights of all persons involved in the educational process and to exercise the highest degree of self-discipline in observing and adhering to legitimate rules and regulations. Responsibility is inherent in the exercise of every right (61:37).

Similarly, a New York statement concluded:

> Rights also entail responsibilities. One of the major goals of this document is to establish a new trust based on the humane values of self-respect and respect for others. No student has the right to interfere with the education of his fellow students. If dialogue is interrupted or destroyed, then the bonds that hold us together are broken. It is thus the responsibility of each student to respect the rights of all who are involved in the educational process (61:37).

A somewhat different opinion was taken by the National School Boards Association:

> It is not true, as it is so often claimed, that every right carries with it a concomitant responsibility. Though there is often a relationship between a student's rights and responsibilities, they exist independent of one another (61:37-38).

Philadelphia told its high school students, "It is the responsibility of each student to respect the right of all who are involved in the educational process" (61:38). Hawaii's Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities stated: "Students shall have the responsibility to learn, and to respect the rights of others to learn. Students shall also respect the rights of others to teach" (65).

That one student's rights end where they disrupt education for another is a theme that runs through the statements on rights and responsibilities of many major school systems.

Allen also supported a larger role for students "in maintenance of school discipline" with consideration given for developing a "bill of rights and responsibilities for students" (66:14). To slow down the trend toward judicial review of school discipline, Walch and Donovan suggested that schools establish their own proceedings in serious discipline matters to the point where the courts will feel little inclined to intervene, and when they do, will be rendering decisions in favor of the schools. They quoted a New York Times editorial that decried the trend, saying:

> To apply legal procedures to questions of school discipline introduces a cure that may be worse than the disease. Educational institutions--ought to be permitted to evolve their own disciplinary, remedial and judicial rules and channels (66:15).

Nolte saw the issue of students and due process as "more mystifying" to educators than such provoking problems as dwindling finances, teacher bargaining, or minority recognition. He stated that student due process "threatens to make public school operations a potential nightmare for many school boards and administrators." According to Nolte, the interpretation being placed on court decisions is that "no student may be denied his full constitutional rights unless it can be demonstrated that an overriding public purpose will indeed be served by denying an individual his rights or by limiting those rights" (61:27).

Erickson maintained that "because of expanded social responsibilities laid on the schools and the increasing 'rights' of disruptive students, the educational effectiveness of schools today is being sabotaged." He stated that the juvenile court system appears to deal rather impotently with severe offenders. As a result, many juveniles are convinced that they have inalienable rights but few responsibilities. As Erickson saw it, there is a growing resentment by teachers and administrators who on one hand are hearing more about being accountable to the public and on the other hand are being denied the authority to act on discipline problems in a decisive and effective manner (29:45-46).

During a Hawaii State House Education Committee hearing, a high school principal made the statement that "since the emergence of collective bargaining and students rights, the role of the principal is becoming increasingly ambiguous and untenable." Wallace, in agreement, declared that the erosion of administrative effectiveness in schools has come about because of the following:

1. the self-destruction aspects of our legal system;

2. teacher overdependence upon union intervention for the settling of administrator-teacher altercations; and

3. the refusal of many parents to assume any responsibility for the behavior of their children (83:19).

Further, she stated that the "paralysis of administrative power," brought about by legal and parental protection of our under-aged criminals, has had devastating effects upon teachers. As she saw it, the principal is no longer in a position to offer teachers substantial support. A principal can be little more than a teacher's indulgent friend--someone to whom teachers may pour out their frustrations, worries or fears, and who only may be counted upon to empathize and understand (83:19).

Thomas was convinced that the courts have not reduced the power of school officials to discipline. He pointed out that courts have not said that reasonable rules and regulations could not be enforced. Court decisions have clearly supported the power of school officials to make schools a safe place for learning. Students are not permitted to interfere with the learning process, and those whose actions are disruptive to the learning process of a school may be disciplined. Thomas emphasized that schools do have the power to establish rules for learning and to enforce those rules (45:309-10). Ferguson suggested that administrators and teachers will come to learn that due process will strengthen, not weaken, their positions within their school and community (30:98).

According to Griffiths, in the area of student rights the principal is the man in the middle. He is caught in the crossfire of multiple pressure groups asserting divergent, inconsistent, incompatible, and sometimes nebulous demands. The secondary principal is charged with the responsibility to reconcile the rights of the individual students with the mores of the school community. Caught in the crosscurrents of legality, morality, and vested interest, the principal must exercise bold and imaginative leadership (35:30).

Griffiths stressed that court opinions are not a substitute for administrative creativity and instructional effectiveness. While it is imperative that the administrator have a knowledge of the limits of administrative and board authority, if the educative process has been effective, the number of "showdowns" should be few. The principal should be sure of his ground by knowing and understanding the law of his state. To avoid being forced into an indefensible position, he should also be aware of school board rules, regulations, and attitudes on sensitive areas (35:37).

Federal funds, as well as state and district funds, are being used to expand school guard forces, special security aides, and expensive security equipment, while sophisticated security systems have been installed in thousands of schools across the nation.

In order to curb the escalating number of disruptive acts in the schools, the Seventh Hawaii State Legislature (1974) established a statewide school security patrol (Act 186). The program was instituted to prevent further incidents which threaten the personal safety and lives of students, teachers and administrative staff; and to deter further acts of vandalism, burglaries, malicious fires, hijacking, drug sales and use, as well as other activities inimical to academic pursuits in the public schools (57:2).

Evaluation proved the effectiveness of school security patrol services in reducing antisocial behaviors such as assaults/fights, rule breaking, disorderly/disruptive behaviors, drug sales/use, gambling, hijacking, illegal parking, intimidation/threats, loitering, outsiders on campus, setting off explosives, break-ins, fires, thefts, and vandalism (57:61).

Principals' decisions to request continuation of services included the following factors:

1. The presence of the security patrols lessened anxiety for everyone.

2. Principals felt they could carry out their other responsibilities rather than being forced to constantly patrol their campuses.

3. Principals judged their campuses to be more quiet, peaceful, and orderly.

4. Principals observed that there was minimal loitering, that bathrooms were cleaner and more accessible, and that there was less smoking on campus.

5. Principals felt the number of outsiders were reduced, stating rules, such as requiring passes, could be enforced (57:36-39).

The Principal's Responsibility

Douglass upheld a conviction that high school principals must give careful consideration to the problems of discipline because of the increased criticism of the schools, teachers, and administrators with respect to what many people seem to think is inferior discipline and student behavior today. Drawing a connection between what they consider to be a tendency of teachers and administrators towards softness and what they consider to be a deterioration of student behavior, parents insist that teachers and principals should be more strict and more severe with youngsters. However, many of these same critics who demand stricter measures against everybody else's children are quick to protest vigorously when their own children are punished. Nevertheless, the individual principal must face the problem of seeing that there is less basis for criticism of his school on this point (6:318).

Jones noted that many school administrators are torn between taking a firm stand and relaxing normal regulations. He stated:

> When the troubled educator seeks answers to the complex questions concerning discipline in the schools today, one of the first things he finds is that a not-so-subtle war is being waged between two camps with decidedly different approaches to solving the problem. The battle is between those who believe the answer lies in the return to some good, old-fashioned law and order in the classroom, and those

> who contend that more, not less, student freedom is the ultimate answer to better behavior in schools. . . .
>
> So today's educator is faced with maintaining a delicate balance between too little and too much discipline, between the obvious need for authority in the schools and contemporary society's trend toward less authority in the home and community, and between the adult cry for law and order and the student cry for greater autonomy.
>
> The educator must try to put these conflicting views into perspective and then build, from the ground up, a solid but fair program of discipline--one that will not only keep the troublemakers in line, but give all students enough latitude to develop into satisfied, well rounded individuals (60:9-12).

Anderson and Van Dyke contended that people in general look upon the principal as the "disciplinarian" of the school. They concluded by saying:

> A popular criterion for judging the success of a high school principal is his ability to maintain standards of student conduct appropriate to a good setting for learning; if he lacks this ability, he is in trouble. Teachers expect the principal to be their most dependable source of assistance in dealing with difficult cases. Members of the board of education and the superintendent of schools expect to be kept informed on serious discipline problems, but for the most part they delegate to the principal the responsibility for these matters in his school. Students recognize him as the man in charge as well as a friend and counselor in episodes of misbehavior on their part. The police, juvenile courts, and other community agencies look to him as the liaison person in the school with whom they will work most closely in dealing with juvenile problems (1:359).

Bent and McCann agreed with the point of view that the apparent outward control of student behavior is often the first criterion by which the administrative quality of a principal and the quality of the school program are popularly judged (3:224).

Gorton noted that in recent years the legitimate authority of the administrator has come under attack from many sectors. Student activists, teacher militants and parents who demand greater involvement in school decision-making are three of the main forces which have challenged the right of the administrator to determine the behavior of others. These groups have steadily grown more reluctant either to recognize or accept the legitimate authority of the administrator in an increasing number of areas of school life. Their challenges have created serious problems for the administrator. Gorton explained:

> In the past, students, teachers, and parents generally did what the administrator wanted because they believed that he had a legitimate right to direct their behavior. As long as the administrator's legitimate authority was accepted by others, it was seldom necessary for him to invoke that authority in order to accomplish a particular goal. In the last few years, however, students, teachers, and parents have begun to challenge the administrator by questioning his decisions, requests, or the authority vested in him by the organization. Too often he has discovered that this type of authority can no longer be exercised effectively, since many people have ceased to believe in the right of the administrator to take certain action, based on his position within the organization. As a result, the administrator's legitimate authority has become noticeably weaker, and he cannot continue to assume that students, teachers, or parents will automatically comply with his requests, directives, or orders (7:308).

He added that although some administrators and supervisors may be reluctant to exercise authority, because of the challenges to administrative authority, it should be clear that if the administrator is to perform his assigned responsibilities effectively and if he is to work with others in the improvement of the organization and the achievement of its goals, it will be necessary for him to utilize authority. The use of authority is an inescapable aspect of an administrator's job (7:310).

Gorton upheld his belief that to be effective in exerting leadership with the various individuals and groups with whom the administrator works, his actions must be based in large part on his expert knowledge and skill in the area under consideration, rather than on authority. No longer can the administrator depend on his legitimate authority as the only or even primary basis for obtaining cooperation from those people with whom he has contact. Today's administrator must develop or improve his expertise as an educational leader by improving his knowledge and skill in the areas of instruction, curriculum, decision-making, communication, and leadership (7:319).

DeWitt determined that because administrators have been challenged to loosen the bonds of tradition, it becomes necessary to take a serious look at redefining their role (27:350).

Weaver contended that whereas the principal's energies were once in the direction of administration--the management of resources, the efforts of the secondary educator must now be directed toward the larger process of exercising leadership--organizing and directing groups toward mutually acceptable goals. The educational leader must now organize groups for the resolution and/or management of conflict, decentralize the education establishment and provide for maximum student involvement in the educative process. The exercise of leadership in today's secondary school, therefore, requires skills beyond those required of administrators in the past (16:56). Goodlad was also convinced that the individual school principal should become "not an arm of management but the leader of the organic unit that is the school" (55:2).

Cereghino agreed that the nature of the administrator's leadership role has changed. He concluded that the good administrator is one who creates a system which demands the least amount of his management and the most amount of the teachers' and students' creativity. Conversely, a poor administrator is more apt to build a system which will operate only with unceasing supervision (23:528).

Landers and Silverman saw the principal's role changing, his "position power" diminishing. They stated that as the principal's authority decreases, the need for leadership increases. Today, a principal's success depends upon "leadership skills" rather than "position power." They emphasized that "the principal must be--regardless of the changing demands and constraints--a productive principal" (39:45-46).

Richardson commented that the school should establish a social structure that ensures a harmonious school society in which the rights and responsibilities of all its members are respected (44:65). Ackerly put it this way: "Schools must be controlled, in accordance with valid constitutional and statutory principles, with authority exercised in a reasonable manner and in accordance with due process" (18:9).

Larson felt that a revised system of discipline must be created which will take into account extending rights to students; the necessity of preserving reasonable supervision; the necessity of protecting the safety, health, and well-being of students; and which extends a humanitarian concept of law, order, and justice to the individual (9:184).

Childs pointed out an attitudinal lag on the part of school administrators who must develop and implement policies and procedures congruent with predominant court opinion. He noted that a recent survey revealed that many secondary school principals are unaware of, or fail to comply with, recent court decisions. Although many principals do know the facts of landmark cases and their significance for school administrators, this knowledge has little apparent effect on their attitude and actions (24:72).

To ensure student rights within an orderly school climate, Childs believed that administrators must adjust their attitudes. The demands for change in the schools require adaptable, skillful administrators with both firm principles and a sensitivity to reality (24:72).

A report adapted from a workshop on "Violence and Vandalism" during a national conference for secondary principals noted a proposal by Maynard that more schools solve the problems of violence and vandalism by improving the "school climate." The elements that characterize this approach include: sound staff philosophy, development of trust, open and honest communications, shared leadership, high involvement, and the acquisition of skills to carry out these components of a positive school climate. Maynard believed that incorporating these elements in the school program, along with a few basic but clearly defined rules that are reasonable, fair and consistent, will bring about feelings of ownership and pride that help eliminate violence and vandalism. Workshop participants agreed that a healthy school climate includes student involvement, high trust levels, fair and just dealings, high regard for personal property, absence of intimidation, feelings of security, close working relationships with community, climate of mutual respect and understanding, clearly understood rules, and school pride (68:31-32).

Larson listed a set of principles of secondary school discipline which he believed had not been outmoded by the youth revolution:

> 1. Disciplinary policies should be in harmony with the total goals of education. The disciplinary procedures of a school should never be permitted to become an end in themselves, nor be confused with procedures necessary in other types of institutions. The first criterion for any secondary school disciplinary procedure should be the question, "Is this a sound educational practice?"
>
> 2. Disciplinary policies should be in harmony with the teachings of science; notably psychology and sociology.
>
> 3. Disciplinary policies should be in harmony with the principles of a democractic society; i.e., equal justice for all, respect for the rights and

dignity of the individual, humanitarian treatment for all.

4. Disciplinary policies should stress the responsibilities as well as the rights of an individual.

5. Disciplinary policies should be positive and directed to the goal of self-discipline. The emphasis should be on the benefits to the group and the individual of good self-discipline rather than on punitive measures.

6. Disciplinary policies should be primarily preventive, secondarily corrective, and never retributive (9:84).

Vredevoe discussed practices which seem to influence good behavior on the part of the students within the schools. These practices are summarized as follows:

1. Competence and leadership in the administrators who must accept responsibility and identification with behavior patterns of the school.

2. Competent teachers and counselors, who understand the age level with which they work but also are sincere in becoming effective in the achievement and good behavior of the individual student.

3. An understanding on the part of students and faculty members of the need for rules, regulations, and their enforcement.

4. Strict enforcement of rules and regulations by all administrators and teachers.

5. Challenge of the work, assignments, and activities in the school.

6. Punishment which recognizes the maturity of the individual involved.

7. Fairness and understanding in dealing with disciplinary cases.

8. Professional dress, conduct, and relationship with colleagues on the part of all staff members.

9. The cooperative development of rules and regulations by groups of students, faculty and parents.

10. Positive attitudes toward law enforcement and discipline on the part of parents and constituents.

11. An understanding of the adopted standards and rules, their origin, value, purpose, relationship to individual, group welfare, and the educational process.

12. Emphasis upon self-discipline on the part of all individuals in the group (15:20-23).

These practices are not new Vredevoe admitted; however, they describe the conditions under which the best chances and evident success in developing good school behavior and standards exist (15:23).

Of major concern to the high school principal are the governmental aspects of student control. The majority of these problems originate in the total school environment. Bent and McCann illustrated a variety of situations which demands specific planning for behavior control or in which infractions of accepted standards of conduct produce behavioral problems of concern to the school:

1. Travel by students to and from school--whether by school bus, by family-owned automobile, by public transportation, or on foot

2. Student automobile problems, including student ownership and support of automobiles, driving to school, noon-hour driving, drag racing, and various hot rod activities

3. Student activities on stairs and in corridors, in locker areas, restrooms, cafeterias, the auditorium, study halls, or other areas where students come together in groups

4. Extraclassroom activities, such as on-the-job work experience, driver education, excursions,

and field trips

5. Noon-hour activities in general

6. Athletic games, plays, concerts, or similar activities open to the public

7. Parties, dances, banquets, and other school social affairs

8. Fire drills, assemblies, and rallies

9. Dating and boy-girl relationships in general--as far as school responsibility may go

10. Congregation of students on the streets or in public places, such as theaters, teenage centers, skating rinks, or restaurants, as a result of school associations (3:226)

According to Austin, French, and Hull, the principal should establish a fundamentally sound school situation from which good discipline is a natural outgrowth. The principal who seeks to lay a sound foundation for good discipline in his school will look deeply into its program and practices. One way to begin is for the principal to lead the staff of the school in developing common understandings and working agreements concerning disciplinary aims and policies (2:386).

Douglass stressed that every student and every teacher should feel that all the staff stand together on all matters of discipline and that the principal stands squarely behind the staff in all cases in which the student is wrong. Except in cases of gross injustice, the principal should not give evidence of his unwillingness to support the teacher in the presence of students, even though the teacher may not have used the best judgment. Not only should the student's confidence and respect for the teacher be upheld, but also the student's belief in the fairness of the teacher should be maintained (6:339).

Linder and Gunn agreed with many authorities that one of the charges most frequently leveled by teachers is that the principal does not adequately support them in their demands for respectful behavior in the classroom (10:62). It was their belief that no principal can afford to develop the reputation of not supporting his teachers in classroom discipline (10:70). Anderson and Van Dyke emphasized that the principal must be on his guard constantly in backing teachers in discipline cases, for unless teachers have confidence in his support of them, maintaining a good program of discipline in a school is a lost cause (1:382). Williams felt that the principal has an obligation to support and to assist the teacher in maintaining order in the classroom. Each teacher has the duty to enforce good student behavior in such a way that the school's policy on discipline is followed; consequently, the principal is in a position to back the teacher in his handling of the case (17:385). Bent and McCann stressed that administrative action should be keyed to support teachers in classroom situations, as well as in disciplinary problems arising in all areas in which student activity takes place. They emphasized that discipline is a team responsibility. The principal and his associates have the responsibility for developing common attitudes and common attacks by the entire staff upon the problems of student behavior (3:236-38).

In a discussion of the principal's responsibility for student behavior, Burrup stated that although the principal is ultimately responsible, he must rely on strong teacher support. Certain understandings are necessary to make such cooperation effective:

> 1. Teachers must be expected to take care of all except the extraordinary cases of discipline in their own classes and activity programs. Referring all cases of misbehavior to the principal is a thing of the past.
>
> 2. The principal is obligated to actively support teachers in their disciplinary actions--provided they are reasonable. This implies that general principles and practices of acceptable behavior must be agreed upon and practiced. There is no room for the teacher who indiscriminately administers corporal punishment at one extreme or complete permissiveness at the other and expects full defensive support from the principal.
>
> 3. Principals should be informed of all major behavior problems experienced by faculty members. There is nothing to be gained by completely covering up problems which are beyond the ability of the teacher to solve.
>
> 4. Preventive discipline presupposes that the administrator and the faculty have done their best to construct a challenging and worthwhile school program. The teachers have an obligation to do the best possible job of teaching, to provide instruction that is meaningful, and in every way possible to keep pupils interested in becoming educated. This will not eliminate all behavior problems, but it will greatly reduce them.
>
> 5. The services of qualified counselors and guidance workers should be provided to assist in finding the causes for deviate behavior. Their function usually does not include actual assignment of punishment or penalty. This is the responsibility of the classroom teacher or the school principal or other designated school official.
>
> 6. A minimum number of regulations deemed essential for the proper conduct of students in and out of classrooms and buildings must be formulated--either understood by tradition or put in written form.

> Students, teachers, parents, and administrators all have a part in the determination of these rules of conduct. Pupils have a right in the determination of these rules of conduct. Pupils have a right to know what is expected of them and a right to expect that teachers and administrators will be consistent in their application and enforcement of conduct standards. This is particularly important in the area of student activities, such as school assemblies and athletic contests.
>
> 7. Routine matters, such as those dealing with attendance, should be organized in such a way that they can be handled efficiently and with good rapport between students and teachers.
>
> 8. Ample provision should be made for interpretation and adjustment of operational rules of conduct. Students, faculty, and administrators should be involved cooperatively in such procedures (4:143-44).

Wint offered the Wyandanch High School experience as a basic strategy for solving the problem of school violence or at least dealing with it at the overt level. The principles and strategies established by the principal, Kight, ended violence in his school. Once filled with violence, Wyandanch today is one of the most peaceful and highly organized schools in the nation. Wint presented Kight's principles and strategies which he considered to be very important in the organization and administration of schools "in a world torn by violence, vulgarity, and a conglomeration of lifestyles" (51:175).

According to Wint, principals must have a clear idea of the purpose of the school and must have developed a basic strategy for achieving that purpose. Secondly, the principal must let the students know who runs the school. Every principal has certain powers at his command that he can use to achieve order and discipline. Wint felt that it takes a combination of firm conviction for law and order and humane consideration for a principal to operate a school. Noting that effective discipline requires effective planning, he listed Kight's guiding principles in handling discipline:

> 1. Kight spells out the rules in the students' handbook. No student can plead ignorance of school rules.
>
> 2. Kight supports his teachers at all times. When a student appears in Kight's office, the incident is recorded in the student's files and the student is reprimanded or punished or counseled.
>
> 3. Punishment is swift. Cases are usually dealt with on the same day an infraction occurs.
>
> 4. Punishment is consistent for all students. There are no favorites. It doesn't matter whether the student is black, white, or the son of a board member; he gets the same treatment.
>
> 5. Accurate records are kept. There is a file for every student.
>
> 6. Parents are brought into the picture. When a student is sent home, he may not return without his parent. Parent involvement is extremely important in solving discipline problems.
>
> 7. Students who are chronic disciplinary cases are removed from the regular school setting to an afternoon adjustment program.
>
> 8. Court cases are pursued to the end. Many principals fail to do this, because it is time consuming. Kight takes time to see them through (51:176).

Wint concluded that most principals are aware of these administrative and organizational strategies, but many of them lack the guts to apply them. If violence in our schools is to end, Wint asserted that we must have strong principals--principals with insight into human nature, organizational ability, and the strength of character to enforce reasonable rules fairly and consistently (51:176).

Van Avery took a different approach to solutions for school violence. He felt that principles and strategies that nurture humaneness and foster respect for individual differences are possible solutions to the strife in our schools. A principal must have a clear idea that schools are people and resources--not merely buildings and schedules. Decision making and policy making require some form of participation by all the people who are affected. It is the principal's duty to provide skills in group process that allow students, staff, parents, and board members the opportunity to be continually creating this open system (48:177).

According to Van Avery, schools should teach responsibility. In order to help students act in a responsible manner, schools should maintain an environment which is positive, where people are respected and liked; which is open, where choices can be made; which is caring, where concern is modeled by others; and which is supportive, where people are helped in gathering information. In this humane approach, Van Avery felt we may find a viable alternative to destruction (48:177).

Summary

Principals of high schools recognize that they must cope with various sources of conflict, and often the seeds of conflict are sown by the students.

The youth revolution of the late sixties brought about momentous changes in a very short time. Young people, responding aggressively in a movement against authority, initiated a new set of beliefs, understandings, ways of perceiving, and new values and value choices that governed thoughts and actions. One writer took the position that in the youthful opposition there was an overlap of two distinct revolutions, characterized by a mixture of the old and the new: the need to fulfill the promises of the past, and at the same time, to define the possibilities of the future. Intermixed with the violence and disruption on the high school level, two healthy impulses were cited: a deep longing for a more generous humanity and the desire for more authentic programmatic participation and responsibility. Although student unrest seems to have abated, some believe student activism could surface again.

The release of the Senate subcommittee's report on school crime in April 1975 left no doubt that vandalism and violence, escalating rapidly, had become one of the foremost problems of the nation's schools. The public in general most often state the reason for the upswing in vandalism and violence on the school campus is the decline of discipline among the nation's youth. Parents, teachers and administrators all blame each other for failing to deal with the problem of discipline. Much of the blame falls on teacher apathy: that is, guiding and directing students only in the classroom, leaving the responsibility of controlling misbehavior elsewhere entirely to the administration; parental permissiveness/irresponsibility/indifference; and principals, failing to report incidents, preferring to handle school crimes as discipline problems.

The following were also claimed to be causes of the growth of vandalism and violence in the high school: compulsory education, gangs, drug use/abuse, glamorization of violence on television, disorganized or broken families, lethargic courts, student rights, openness of schools in terms of student freedoms, social protest, and alienation. Although the main source of many offenses lie in the features of the broad society, schools can aggravate the problems or reduce it.

Disruption and disrespect have increased noticeably in Hawaii's public schools. According to one writer, parents blame the school for being permissive, teachers blame administrators for not being firm, and the administrators blame the parents for molding such kids in the first place. Principals are afraid to do anything because of the strict guidelines for suspending students from school. Vandalism and violence, a complex problem involving all aspects of life in the community, can be related to ethnic diversity, while immigrant assimilation continues to be a problem in Island schools.

Although the public is demanding tougher discipline measures, there has been an organized movement to ban corporal punishment in the nation's schools. In 1972 the

Ware v. Estes case put an end, for the time being, to change the traditional decisions of the nation's courts to generally uphold the use of corporal punishment. Although attempts have been made to have courts declare the use of corporal punishment in violation of the Eighth Amendment, as yet, no court of record has declared the use of corporal punishment to be unconstitutional.

The relatively new emphasis on student rights in secondary schools makes it imperative that the principal keep abreast of court rulings. Traditionally, the courts have not interfered in the management of the schools, adopting the concept of "reasonableness" as the standard for measuring the constitutionality of a school rule or an educational practice. An example of the dichotomy between student conduct that school officials may prohibit and student conduct that must be permitted is shown in the two cases of Burnside and Blackwell. These cases were judged on the reasonableness of the school rule, along with the evidence of disruption or interference with the educational process. Although the Gault case in 1967 stamped judicial approval on the movement to grant more constitutional rights to young people, the single case that most revolutionized law in the secondary schools was the landmark Tinker decision in 1969. Whereas in the past the burden of proof rested with the student attacking the "reasonableness" of the school rule, in Tinker the burden of proof was shifted to the school authorities who now must justify their actions by showing that the prohibitions they impose on freedom of expression are necessary because of conduct that interferes materially and substantially with school operations. The aftermath of Tinker saw a multitude of constitutional attacks in federal and state courts on school rules that restricted freedom of expression.

Although courts have carefully considered the application of constitutional rights to students and have diligently examined cases in these terms, the results have not been consistent. The question of long hair on high school boys posed by the student rights movement generated intense emotion and resulted in extensive litigation. Court decisions in these cases indicated that the schools do have a right to enforce student dress and grooming regulations, providing there is factual evidence that the mode of appearance being regulated disrupts the effective and efficient maintenance of the educational program of the school. In the area of student rights of freedom of written expression, the direction of court opinion is toward broadening high school students' rights to publish and distribute their views. Again, decisions have rested on the evidence of disruption of school operations. When the search and seizure aspect of student rights has been challenged, courts have tended to the opinion that lockers belong to the school, not to the student. Based upon the interpretation of the courts that lockers are public and not private property, school officials have reserved the right to search property in the school, even though it has been assigned to students.

The issue of procedural due process and the rights of students was addressed in the Goss case. In this decision the Court outlined procedures for suspensions of 10 days or less and indicated that more formal procedures may be required in the case of suspensions of longer than 10 days or in the case of expulsions. In establishing personal liability under Wood, the Court emphasized that educators are bound to abide by constitutional law, not just educational policy. For most educators the Goss and Wood decisions stood for the idea of fair and responsible treatment of students in disciplinary actions. However, some educators felt that these decisions spell the end of the administrator's almost total control over the disciplinary process.

Because recent court decisions have indicated in explicit terms the constitutional limits of the school's powers over the student as an individual, due process is an important issue that must be considered by all administrators. A number of writers suggested that a useful approach to student rights is the planning of a written code of student rights and responsibilities. That one student's rights end where they disrupt education for another is a theme that runs through the statements on rights and responsibilities of many major school systems. Some writers saw the issue of student rights and due process as a threat to public schools, with the result that the educational effectiveness of schools will deteriorate. Others were convinced that the courts have not reduced the power of school officials to discipline.

Schools across the nation have instituted various types of security programs. In Hawaii the school security patrol services have proven successful in reducing antisocial behaviors, and principals have requested the continuation of the services.

Because of the increased criticism of the schools, teachers and administrators, high school principals must give careful consideration to the problems of discipline. The apparent outward control of student behavior is often the first criterion by which the administrative ability of the principal and the quality of the school program are judged. In recent years the legitimate authority of the principal has come under attack; no longer can the administrator depend on his legitimate authority as the only or even primary basis for obtaining cooperation from those people with whom he has contact. Several writers stressed that the efforts of the secondary administrator must be directed toward the process of exercising leadership.

Principals must take into account extending rights to students and develop and implement policies and procedures congruent with predominant court opinion. The principal should lead the staff of the school in developing common understandings and working agreements concerning disciplinary aims and policies. All the staff should stand together on all matters of discipline and the principal should stand squarely behind the staff. Although the principal is ultimately responsible, he must rely on strong teacher support. In this way discipline becomes a team responsibility.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The major purpose of this study was to establish the role of the principal in maintaining discipline in the high school. The assumption was that when the administration is disturbed with provoking problems of discipline, the educational objectives of the school cannot be achieved.

This study was conducted with the null hypothesis that:

1. There is no correlation between the size of a school, in terms of the student population, and the crime rate. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was utilized to test the data.

2. A questionnaire instrument was designed and distributed to selected students, teachers, and school administrators to determine causative and resultant factors regarding school discipline and behavior.

The questionnaire aspects of the investigation were designed to determine (1) the frequency of various behavior problems; (2) methods of handling student behavior difficulties; (3) locations in school buildings and school grounds where difficulties occur most frequently; (4) attitudes of principals concerning the extent of school-community relations: (5) principals' evaluations of the cooperation from parents; (6) reactions of principals concerning whether teachers are doing all they can to maintain good discipline; (7) responses of principals concerning how well they are being supported in their handling of discipline problems by administrators in positions higher than theirs; and (8) principals' viewpoints concerning measures which would be most helpful to improve discipline in their schools.

Student behavior is the resultant of the convergence of a number of variables, thus, it was felt that a study of school discipline should include the customs among students, attitudes of students, teachers and parents toward the school, the pattern of interpersonal relations in the school, as well as the orientation of the principal and the teachers with respect to their roles.

The questionnaire plan was designed following extensive library research. The insight gained from this exploration of the problem and the present status of research pertaining to this and related problems helped to give direction to the investigation and to determine the method to be used in conducting the proposed survey. The questionnaire was selected as the logical instrument for gathering from the teachers and students the type and quantity of information needed. A personal interview was used as the most effective way to obtain the necessary information from principals for this study.

Basis of Selection of the Sample

It was desired that all 21 high schools on the island of Oahu in the state of Hawaii participate in this study. The four district superintendents were contacted to obtain approval to conduct the questionnaire in their areas. In turn, these superintendents directed letters to principals in their districts endorsing the study on a voluntary basis. Those high schools who consented to participate in the study were:

Leeward Oahu District

Campbell High School
Ewa Beach, Hawaii

Nanakuli High & Intermediate School
Nanakuli, Hawaii

Pearl City High School
Pearl City, Hawaii

Waianae High School
Waianae, Hawaii

Waipahu High School
Waipahu, Hawaii

Windward Oahu District

Castle High School
Kaneohe, Hawaii

Kahuku High & Elementary School
Kahuku, Hawaii

Kailua High School
Kailua, Hawaii

Kalaheo High School
Kailua, Hawaii

Central Oahu District

Leilehua High School
Wahiawa, Hawaii

Mililani High School
Wahiawa, Hawaii

Moanaloa High School
Honolulu, Hawaii

Radford High School
Honolulu, Hawaii

Waialua High & Intermediate School
Waialua, Hawaii

Honolulu District

Farrington High School
Honolulu, Hawaii

Kaimuki High School
Honolulu, Hawaii

Kaiser High School
Honolulu, Hawaii

Kalani High School
Honolulu, Hawaii

Roosevelt High School
Honolulu, Hawaii

Each principal was then consulted as to a convenient method/ time to gather the needed information. Of the 21 principals contacted, only two principals refused to participate in the study.

Development of the Instrument

Items of the interview and questionnaire were devised from several sources: (1) information gathered from the research literature, (2) consultations with educational and research designers, and (3) the investigator's experience as a teacher dealing with students and parents.

The principal interview instrument may be seen in Appendix A-1. Answers were noted by the interviewer as the interview proceeded. Information was requested about the enrollment and grade organization of the school, the number of security personnel servicing the school, the geographic location of the school, the socioeconomic level of the community in which the school was located, and the mobility and ethnic mix of the community. Opinions were sought regarding the extent of school-community relations, parental participation in the school program, and teacher cooperation in matters of discipline. An effort was made to ascertain policies of dissemination and enforcement of rules and regulations; the areas, time, and frequency of discipline problems; and special programs instituted to combat behavior problems. Principals were questioned about their feelings of authority and support from superiors in dealing with matters of discipline. Lastly, principals were asked to give their views on the ingredient most needed to improve school discipline and/or the key to good school discipline.

A pilot study was conducted and both teacher and student questionnaires were revised as shown in Appendix A-2 and A-3. A letter attached to the teacher questionnaire explained the purpose of the inquiry and requested the recipient to cooperate in the study. An envelope was provided for confidentiality of the returns.

The teacher questionnaire was four pages in length. The first page was concerned with the teachers' knowledge and attitude toward discipline problems on their particular campus. They were questioned as to their beliefs of the reasons for these disruptions. On the second page an effort was made to access teacher-parent relationships and teacher-teacher contacts. Teachers were asked to give their opinions on reasons schools differ in degree of discipline problems; the ways these problems should be handled; and possible solutions to problems of discipline. Page three was concerned with teacher and student attitude toward the school and opinions of teachers about their responsibility in maintaining discipline. In addition, an effort was made to discover the mode of the administration of the school as perceived by the teacher. Continuing on page four, this avenue was explored further.

The student questionnaire consisted of three pages. The first page was concerned with student and parental attitudes toward the school and participation in school activities. On the second page students were asked to evaluate the principal, counselors and teachers. Further, they were questioned on their knowledge of school discipline policy. Students were also asked about their reaction to an observation of an illegal act on the part of a fellow student. Page three was concerned with the tone of the school and opinions from students on reasons and possible solutions to problems of discipline.

Distribution and Returns

An appointment was made and questionnaires were delivered to each of the 19 schools. It was requested that teacher questionnaires be distributed at random and student questionnaires to junior students in heterogeneous classes. An appointment was made to pick up the completed questionnaires and, at that same time, to interview the principal. Questionnaires for junior students were completed in all schools; however, teachers in three schools (CR-8, CR-12 and CR-13 failed to cooperate in the study. The teacher sample consisted of 130 teachers in 16 schools, or ten percent of the teachers in each school. The student sample consisted of 430 eleventh grade students in 19 schools, or five percent of the juniors in each school. Seventeen principals participated in the study, while principals in two schools (CR-12 and CR-13) were "too busy" to grant interviews at the time of the survey.

Treatment of the Data

For this study schools were ranked as presented in Table 1. Data were obtained from the Honolulu Police Department, 1976 annual report. Juvenile arrests by schools were incorporated in the report. Part I included the following offenses: murder, manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny and auto theft. Part II included the following offenses: other assaults, arson, forgery, counterfeiting, fraud, embezzlement, stolen property, vandalism, weapons, prostitution, sex offenses, narcotic drug laws, gambling, liquor laws, disorderly conduct, vagrancy and all other offenses.

The data in Table 1 represents the total of Part I and Part II offenses for the schools chosen for this study. Part I and Part II offenses were used to arrive at the shown ranking. This implied the assumption of a positive linear relationship between Part I and Part II offenses. It was reasonable to expect schools with high Part I offenses to likewise display high Part II offenses and vice versa. Therefore, assuming that the relationship that exists between Part I and Part II offenses is linear, it was expected that the population correlation coefficient would be positive. The null hypothesis that the population correlation coefficient is zero versus the alternative that the correlation coefficient is positive was tested. The result was the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted at the .001 significance level.

The data used in Table 1 was deemed to be the most appropriate available for this study. The Department of Education could only furnish incomplete/inaccurate data pertaining to violence and vandalism. Burglary data are available in the form of original purchase costs of items reported by the schools, libraries, and offices as stolen and include only state owned property. Personal property, cash and supplies are not included in the data (64:11). In January 1978 a state House subcommittee on school violence and vandalism recommended that the Department of Education establish a comprehensive data collection system on incidences of school violence (71:13).

5

Table 1

Schools Ranked by Juvenile Arrests

School	I	II	Total
CR-1	205	144	349
CR-2	168	112	280
CR-3	118	123	241
CR-4	124	115	239
CR-5	97	115	212
CR-6	133	76	209
CR-7	81	110	191
CR-8	88	100	188
CR-9	109	64	173
CR-10	104	54	158
CR-11	96	57	153
CR-12	69	79	148
CR-13	81	52	133
CR-14	42	61	103
CR-15	65	35	100
CR-16	66	27	93
CR-17	49	34	83
CR-18	29	40	69
CR-19	24	27	51

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter was to present the results of the questionnaires of discipline as encountered and handled by students, teachers and high school principals on the island of Oahu in the state of Hawaii.

Hypotheses of the Study

In order to determine the role of the principal in maintaining discipline in the high school, a questionnaire instrument was designed, developed and administered to the principals, teachers and students of 19 of the 21 high schools on the island of Oahu in the State of Hawaii.

The questionnaires were designed to elicit opinions of students, teachers and administrators about the pattern of interpersonal relations in the school. The data from the questionnaire were statistically correlated according to the Spearman Rank Correlation.

As reported in the previous chapter, information from principals was gathered by means of personal interviews. Each interviewee was encouraged to discuss insights and ideas relevent to the topic of discussion. The following information was sought: (1) the make-up of the schools, (2) school-community relations, (3) the extent of cooperation from parents, teachers and superiors, (4) the areas in which behavior problems occur, (5) the period in time in which discipline problems occur and the frequency of occurrence, (6) special programs to combat discipline problems, (7) the position of authority of individual principals, and (8) views pertaining to good school discipline.

School Size

It was hypothesized that the size of the school, in terms of the student population, could be related to crime rate. With a large number of students it was considered probable that there would be a greater crime rate than in schools of lesser population.

In testing the association between the school's population and crime rate, the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used. A coefficient correlation of .66 was computed, which verified a positive correlation between these measures. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to establish the validity of the hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The data was presented in Appendix B-1.

Grade Structure

The organizational structures of participating schools were summarized in Appendix B-2. It will be observed that most schools surveyed were organized according to a ninth-through-twelfth-grade pattern. Thirteen, or 68 percent of the schools, were organized on this basis.

Three, or 16 percent of the schools, followed a tenth-through-twelfth-grade pattern of organization. Two, or 11 percent of the schools, followed a seventh-through-twelfth-grade pattern, while only one school was structured from kindergarten through twelfth grade.

Geographic Location of Community

Table 2 summarizes the geographic locations of the participating schools. Eight, or 42 percent of the schools, were located in suburban areas, while five, or 26 percent of the schools, were reported as being situated in the city. Six, or 32 percent of the schools, could be classed as rural schools.

Table 2

Geographic Location of Communities of Participating Schools
(N = 19)

Classification	Number	Percent
Rural	6	32
Suburban	8	42
City	5	26

Socioeconomic Level of Community

As exhibited in Table 3, slightly more than 50 percent of the surveyed schools could be categorized as being middle socioeconomic status. Five, or 26 percent of the schools, were characterized as being within the lower socioeconomic group, while four, or 21 percent of the schools, fell within the upper socioeconomic level.

Table 3

Socioeconomic Levels of Communities of Participating Schools
(N = 19)

Classification	Number	Percent
Upper	4	21
Middle	10	53
Lower	5	26

Enrollment Trends

Information was sought concerning the growth, stability, declining enrollments, and transiency of school populations. Table 4 summarized the growth rates of high schools included in the sample. It may be seen that only one school was experiencing rapid growth; in contrast, six, or 35 percent of the schools, were in areas of declining enrollments. An additional seven, or 41 percent of the total, reported they were undergoing moderate growth. Three, or 18 percent of the principals, were in schools that were described as stable as far as enrollments were concerned. Six, or 35 percent of the schools, had an additional characteristic of transiency in school population. It should be noted that transiency primarily occurs with schools serving families assigned to nearby military facilities. Principals reported 30 percent to 70 percent enrollment of military dependents in these schools.

Table 4

Rate of Growth of School Community
(N = 17)

Classification	Number	Percent
Rapid Growth	1	6
Moderate Growth	7	41
Stable	3	18
Declining Enrollment	6	35
Transient	6	35

Student Ethnicity

Table 5 presented the ethnic breakdown of students in the public high schools included in this study. Data were obtained from computer printouts made available by the Compensatory Education Division of the State of Hawaii Department of Education. The data exhibited represents the results of a recent ethnic survey. Although methods used to gather the information were not all reliable, Department of Education officials do not feel the results are far off the mark.

Security Programs

All schools surveyed had some form of security personnel. In high crime rate schools principals reported that Burns, a contracted private security agency, patrolled the campuses, generally at night. A majority of the schools

Table 5

Student Ethnic Representation in High Schools Surveyed

School	Caucasian	Japanese	Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian	Filipinos	Chinese	Samoans	Koreans	Hispanic	Black	Other
CR-1	8.22	8.87	40.77	14.51	1.40	5.37	4.90	14.72	0.56	0.68
CR-2	2.96	16.35	16.47	41.41	3.59	7.17	2.26	7.44	0.30	2.05
CR-3	25.02	12.14	31.88	6.48	2.92	1.32	1.14	8.92	0.42	9.76
CR-4	26.64	22.85	9.02	22.13	1.78	1.72	2.30	5.62	4.88	3.06
CR-5	32.20	10.00	15.02	24.30	3.00	2.40	0.50	9.86	0.80	1.92
CR-6	10.28	32.52	23.28	7.68	6.88	1.54	1.28	9.52	0.37	6.65
CR-7	54.41	6.42	19.33	2.28	3.08	1.34	0.52	9.90	2.02	0.70
CR-8	9.18	39.39	15.30	5.08	10.47	4.14	4.43	5.98	0.30	5.73
CR-9	6.86	1.37	60.60	13.33	0.91	8.54	0.38	7.00	0.38	0.63
CR-10	11.78	42.00	12.61	17.21	4.73	1.53	1.04	5.28	0.58	3.24
CR-11	7.52	2.33	12.20	40.16	22.55	4.22	0.94	7.64	0.72	1.72
CR-12	39.32	25.98	13.31	2.92	7.61	0.47	3.76	4.18	0.52	1.93
CR-13	23.42	42.36	9.04	1.80	14.67	0.59	3.33	3.12	0.12	1.55
CR-14	62.00	4.31	4.94	9.52	1.16	3.00	0.89	4.46	4.56	5.16
CR-15	10.54	43.90	17.36	3.23	12.30	0.76	7.12	3.06	0.24	1.49
CR-16	14.64	3.48	37.96	13.34	0.76	15.82	0.74	3.80	3.20	6.26
CR-17	30.68	27.21	7.01	12.25	7.08	1.40	4.31	2.88	3.02	4.16
CR-18	33.30	19.99	7.80	19.99	4.00	0.97	2.10	5.10	2.40	4.35
CR-19	10.00	15.73	22.27	40.39	1.20	1.57	0.37	6.76	0.28	1.43

reported security personnel were provided under the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA). All schools had State Comprehensive Employment and Training (SCET) personnel. The security program was summarized in Table 6.

Table 6

School Security Programs
(N = 17)

Schools	Number of Burns Personnel	Number of CETA Personnel	Number of SCET Personnel
CR-1	1	2	2
CR-2	1	0	1
CR-3	1	0	2
CR-4	1	1	2
CR-5	1/2	1	3
CR-6	1/2	2	5
CR-7	0	1	3
CR-8	0	3	1
CR-9	0	3	2
CR-10	0	0	2
CR-11	1	0	3
CR-14	1/2	2	3
CR-15	0	1	2
CR-16	0	2	3
CR-17	0	0	3
CR-18	0	1	2
CR-19	0	3	1

School-Community Relations

Principals were asked to evaluate their school-community relations. The four schools highest in crime rate reported considerable or extensive school-community relations. Principals stated that the community supports academic, vocational, and cultural programs, athletics and other school events, and extends help in capital improvement projects. Community associations and the military were mentioned as contributors to the school programs in many of the high schools. Little or just passable school-community relations existed in middle crime rate schools, while low crime rate schools reported various degrees of school-community relations. Thus, according to principal interviews, no relationship can be drawn between school-community relations and problems of discipline (Appendix B-3).

Parental Cooperation with the School

A trend was noted in Appendix B-4 with regards to parental participation/cooperation with the school as observed by the principals. In low crime rate schools, parental cooperation was classed as considerable or extensive, while in most high crime rate schools little interest was shown by the parents in the school, or parental participation was categorized as just passable.

Teacher Cooperation

Most principals felt that the majority of the teachers in their schools were doing their fair share in maintaining discipline in the classroom. Only two of the respondents noted that teachers were not required to supervise students on campus, that campus supervision was the responsibility of the security personnel. Several principals reported a small percent of the teachers were not doing their job in the area of discipline. One principal stated that only 25 percent of the teachers in his school cooperated fully in matters of discipline.

Support from Superiors

All principals stated that in handling discipline problems, they received the necessary support from their superiors. No principal complained of a lack of support in this area from either the district or state office.

Dissemination and Enforcement of Rules and Regulations

All principals reported that rules and regulations of their schools were published in some type of student handbook and in the teacher handbook. In addition, a few schools published rules and regulations in bulletins or newspapers. A majority of the principals had student orientation and several schools had teacher orientation regarding rules and regulations of the school.

It was reported by all principals that school rules and regulations were enforced by the principal and vice-principal(s) jointly. In most cases the principal was concerned only with hard-core cases, or situations involved with Rule 21.

Location of Occurrence

According to the responses of principals, school bathrooms and isolated areas on campus are places where principals frequently encounter discipline problems. It should be noted that smoking and fighting in the public high school bathrooms has been a problem of long-standing in Hawaii. Two principals reported that vandalism, as well as other behavior problems, occur in the school parking lot. One principal reported that students cause problems in front of the school, which is technically "off-campus," and another principal cited an off-campus tunnel adjacent to the school grounds as a place of concern. Several principals felt that discipline problems would decrease if the school were fenced, thus eliminating easy access to the campus for outsiders that cause problems. One school reported a noticeable decrease in discipline problems since the school had been fenced.

Period in Time of Occurrence

The majority of principal respondents agreed that the most serious/costly discipline problems occur during the night/on week-ends. Two principals reported that behavior problems occur during the lunch period. One administrator reported that after grading periods, discipline problems occur, while another declared that on unusually hot days students create problems. Another principal stated that discipline problems occur at football games and dances. Yet another principal maintained that most discipline problems occur in February and March.

Frequency of Occurrence

The data exhibited in Table 7 represents the extent to which behavior problems take place in the high school as reported by principals. While truancy was the only problem that a high percentage of administrators (65 percent) rated as occurring frequently, burglary, vandalism, smoking and drug use also received high percentages as occurring both "occasionally" and "frequently." Occurring with moderate frequency were fighting among students and disorderly conduct. Principals surveyed reported eight assaults on teachers in their schools in the past year. Four principals noted problems of occasional brush fires and an additional four administrators had persistent problems with fires in trash receptacles. Principal respondents reported significant fires/arson in the past year included: two offices, an auditorium, two portable classrooms and six classrooms.

Table 7

Frequency of Occurrence of Various Discipline Problems in the High Schools (N = 17)

	Frequency of Occurrence					
	Seldom		Occasionally		Frequently	
Discipline Problem	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Burglary	8	47	6	35	3	18
Vandalism	7	41	9	53	1	6
Fighting among students	9	53	7	41	1	6
Disorderly conduct	11	65	6	35		
Truancy	1	6	5	29	11	65
Smoking	5	29	5	29	7	41
Drug Use	8	47	6	35	3	18

Special Programs

Information obtained concerning special programs to combat discipline problems is exhibited in Appendix B-5. Almost one-half of the schools surveyed had out-reach counselors or provided counseling services for students with behavior problems. Five schools reported the existence of special motivation classes or programs for the alienated student. Three schools reported the availability of alternative schools, while two schools provided a program, school within-a-school, for the alienated student. A relatively new approach, peer group counseling, or student committees were being utilized in four high schools. Immigrant programs were instituted in two high schools, while another two schools reported promoting multi-cultural clubs. In two schools a tutoring center had been established. Four schools reported the use of detention to curb discipline problems. Citing a unique program, one school reported that a discipline panel consisting of students, community (i.e., parents, ministers, armed forces members) and school administrators had been an effective measure in reducing discipline problems.

Circumstances Hindering Authority

Almost one-half of the principals felt no restrictions in their position of authority when dealing with matters of discipline. However, a trend can be noted in Table 8 with regards to circumstances hindering the authority of the principal. In high or medium high crime rate schools, principals felt that their authority was hampered by various circumstances. Student rights, as well as "paper work" with regards to Rule 21, were cited as factors that hinder the authority of principals. Two principals surveyed maintained their authority was restrained by the teacher union, while four principals cited the lack of alternative programs for placement of hard-core cases hindered their authority in dealing with discipline problems at their schools.

Table 8

Factors that Hinder the Authority of the Principal
(N = 17)

School	Student Rights	Teacher Union	Paper Work	Lack of Alternative Programs
CR-1	X			
CR-2				
CR-3				
CR-4	X		X	
CR-5	X	X	X	
CR-6	X		X	X
CR-7			X	
CR-8			X	X
CR-9				
CR-10				
CR-11				
CR-14				
CR-15	X	X		X
CR-16			X	
CR-17				
CR-18				
CR-19				X

Status of Discipline Problems

Table 9 exhibited the opinions of principals, concerning the status of discipline. Eleven principals, or 65 percent of the respondents, stated that discipline problems were decreasing in their schools, while four principals, or 24 percent of the total, stated that discipline problems in their schools have neither increased nor decreased, but have remained much the same. Only one principal felt that discipline problems were increasing in his school.

Table 9

Status of Discipline Problems
(N = 17)

School	Increasing	Decreasing	Remaining the Same	No Opinion
CR-1				X
CR-2		X		
CR-3		X		
CR-4		X		
CR-5		X		
CR-6		X		
CR-7		X		
CR-8		X		
CR-8			X	
CR-10		X		
CR-11		X		
CR-14		X		
CR-15			X	
CR-16			X	
CR-17		X		
CR-18			X	
CR-19	X			

Factors Related to Discipline Problems

When asked why some schools have more discipline problems than others, principals gave a variety of answers. The responses, classed under leadership, staff, community, socioeconomic and student values, were presented in Appendix B-6. Almost one-third of the principals felt that leadership was an important factor related to discipline. It was felt that the style of leadership on the part of the principal accounted for the differences in the extent of discipline problems. Schools having poor or weak leadership were said to have more discipline problems than schools in which the principal exercised strong leadership. It was stated that well-organized schools with rules and regulations spelled out and consistently enforced have fewer discipline problems than schools in which principals have only vague or ambiguous rules and regulations with little enforcement. One principal had this to say: "The principal sets the tone of the school and must actively pursue programs and ways to eliminate discipline problems."

Almost one-third of the surveyed principals stated that a committed staff was a necessary factor in maintaining discipline. Principals believed that schools having a staff that works together as a team have fewer discipline problems than schools in which there is a lack of control/enforcement of the rules and regulations by the staff.

Four principals felt that the socioeconomic level of the community accounted for the differences in the extent of discipline problems. An additional five principals believed that community support or community values were factors related to discipline problems. Principals commented: "When education is valued by the family, there are fewer discipline problems." "If parents feel the school is not important, discipline problems can be expected."

Student attitudes and values are also cited as factors relating to discipline problems.

Good School Discipline

Principals were asked, "What is the key to school discipline?" The following were their responses:

CR-1 "A cadre of good teachers. Cooperative faculty and community."

CR-2 "Get the student to do the right thing without having to be watched."

CR-3 "Teachers are the key. They should make their classes interesting."

CR-4 "Students have to know there are consequences for their actions. Administrators must be fair and just in dealing out penalties."

CR-5 "Teachers and administration working together."

CR-6 "Personnel that will make the procedures work."

CR-7 "Each individual (student) should be heard."

CR-8 "Consistency on the home front. All school personnel should be firm, but fair, human and caring."

CR-9 "Humanitarian treatment of students."

CR-10 "Instilling pride in self and school."

CR-11. "Pride."

CR-14. "Fairness to the student. Build a rapport with the student. Let him know what the school expects."

CR-15. "Additional security aides and another vice-principal."

CR-16. "Transcendental meditation."

CR-17. "Parents that are involved with their children's education."

CR-18. "Student pride in himself and his school. This necessarily includes parents and their support."

CR-19. "Teamwork--administration, faculty, students, parents, and community."

Summary

This section presented the results of analyzed data obtained from principal interviews in high schools on the island of Oahu in the state of Hawaii.

With respect to the size of the school, a positive correlation was established between the school's population and crime rate.

In testing the association between the school's population and crime rate, the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used. A coefficient correlation of .66 was computed, which verified a positive correlation between these measures. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to establish the validity of the hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The data was presented in Appendix B-1.

The majority of schools (13) were organized on a ninth-through-twelfth-grade basis. Of the remainder, one school was structured from kindergarten through twelfth, two followed a seventh-through-twelfth-grade pattern, and three followed a tenth-through-twelfth-grade pattern of organization.

Concerning the geographic location of the schools, 6 were considered rural schools, 8 were located in the suburbs, and 5 were classed as city schools.

Data concerning socioeconomic factors revealed that 5 school communities (26 percent) were at the lower socioeconomic level, 10 (53 percent) at the middle level, and 4 (21 percent) at the upper level.

One school (6 percent) was experiencing rapid growth, 7 (41 percent) were experiencing moderate growth, 3 (18 percent) were stable, 6 (35 percent) were declining in enrollment, and 6 (35 percent) had an additional characteristic of transiency in school population.

Ethnic representation of students in the high schools surveyed was included as a point of interest.

All schools surveyed reported some form of security personnel. Private agencies, as well as government agencies, provided personnel for the security program.

No association was found between school-community relations and crime rate in principal responses. A trend was noted with regards to parental participation/cooperation with the schools. In high crime rate schools principals reported little interest or just passable participation on the part of parents, while parental cooperation was classed as considerable or extensive in low crime rate schools. Principals reported that most teachers were doing their fair share of maintaining discipline in the classroom; however, concern was expressed about the small percentage of teachers who were not cooperating in matters of discipline. All principals stated that they received the necessary support from their superiors in matters dealing with discipline.

All principals reported that school rules and regulations were enforced by the principal and vice-principal(s) jointly. All schools publish their rules and regulations in a student handbook, as well as in the teacher's handbook.

School bathrooms and isolated areas on campus are places where principals frequently encounter discipline problems. The school parking lot and off-campus areas adjacent to the school were also mentioned as "trouble spots." Several principals expressed the opinion that discipline problems would decrease if the school were fenced. The majority of the principals reported that the most serious/costly discipline problems occur during the night/on week-ends.

Although truancy was the only problem that a high percentage of administrators (65 percent) rated as occurring frequently, burglary, vandalism, smoking and drug abuse were reported by a high percentage of principals as occurring both occasionally and frequently. Brush fires and fires in trash receptacles were noted as problems by almost one-half of the principals surveyed. Significant fires/arson in the past year were reported by more than one-half of the respondents.

Principals reported the existence of special programs to combat discipline problems as follows: detention; in-school-suspension; alternative schools; school-within-a-school; alienated programs or special motivation classes; tutoring centers; student committees or peer group counseling; counseling or out-reach counselors; immigrant programs; multi-cultural programs; and a discipline panel.

Almost one-half of the principals felt no restrictions in the position of authority when dealing in matters of discipline. However, a trend was noted with regards to circumstances hindering the authority of the principal. In high or medium high crime rate schools principals stated that they felt hampered by student rights and paper work with regards to Rule 21. The teacher union and the lack of alternative programs for hard-core cases were also mentioned as restraints to some principals' authority.

Most principals (65 percent) felt that discipline problems were decreasing in their schools, while 24 percent of the respondents felt that problems of discipline have remained much the same. Only one principal stated that discipline problems were increasing in his school.

The responses to the question, "Why do some schools have more discipline problems than others?" were classed under leadership, staff, community, socioeconomic and student values. Almost one-third of the principals surveyed felt that the style of leadership determined the differences in the extent of discipline problems. Almost one-third of the respondents stated that a committed staff was needed to maintain proper discipline. The socioeconomic level of the community, and community support or community values, along with student attitudes and values were also mentioned as factors related to discipline problems. The key to good school discipline, according to principals surveyed, included the following: teachers, teamwork, pride, and fair and humane treatment of students.

Teacher Respondents and Schools

The purpose of this section was to present the results of the teacher survey of matters of discipline in the high school. It will be recalled that information from teachers was gathered by means of a questionnaire in which all response categories were structured for the respondent. The data represents the responses of 130 teachers in 16 high schools, or ten percent of the teachers in each school.

While certain questions were structured to obtain personal views, the remainder of the questions were designed to test for a correlation between high crime schools and certain behaviors.

It should be noted that some questions will have several responses by the same teacher. Percentages were based on the number of responses to the item.

Information from Respondents

Question 1. What is your attitude toward property damage and disturbances/acts of violence on the high school campus?

The data in Appendix C-1 indicated that over 60 percent of the teacher respondents were "deeply concerned" about the problem of vandalism and violence on the school campus. No teacher indicated a lack of concern.

Question 2. Do you have personal knowledge of property damage and disturbances/acts of violence on your campus?

Over 80 percent of the responses in Appendix C-2 indicated that teachers were aware of the problems of vandalism and violence on their school campus. Only 3.8 percent of the respondents reported that they were unaware of the problems.

Question 3. What factors do you blame for property damage and disturbances/acts of violence on your campus?

Over 50 percent of the teacher respondents blamed the students and community for property damage and disturbances/acts of violence on their campus. The remainder of the responses were evenly distributed, blaming administration, teachers, facilities and "other." Included in the latter category were write-in answers such as, "parents," "society," and "outsiders." The data are presented in Appendix C-3.

Question 4. In your opinion, why do students damage high school property and create disturbances/indulge in acts of violence on the high school campus?

When teachers were asked to indicate reasons for vandalism and violence, data appeared to be uniformly distributed between boredom, fun, status, attention, and resentment (Appendix C-4).

Question 5. What are the characteristics of students who are involved in vandalism and/or creating disturbances/indulging in acts of violence?

Write-in responses indicating characteristics of students involved in vandalism and violence were evenly filled. Teachers reported unstable home conditions, low ability, no particular ethnic group, low socioeconomic background, and high school boys in the majority of answers. The category "other" included responses such as, "peer pressure," "individual psychological problems," "lack of respect for authority," and "negative self-concept." The data are exhibited in Appendix C-5.

Question 6. To what extent are you acquainted with the parents of your students?

It may be seen in Appendix C-6 that only 24.8 percent of the responses indicated more than a casual acquaintance of the teacher with the parents. In about 30 percent of the responses, it was indicated that the teacher's information of the family came either through heresay, or from the student. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was computed as .48. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level, concluding that high crime rate schools and reports of teachers' minimal familiarity with the parents are associated.

Question 7. What is your evaluation of the interest of the parents in your school?

Considering the interest of parents in the school, data in Appendix C-7 shows a positive correlation of .79 between high crime rate schools and meddlesome and resentful parents. In evaluating the data "unaware" and "indifferent" were combined, as were "meddlesome" and "resentful." Only 32.7 percent of the responses indicated parental concern in the school. However, the correlation was suggestive of an association between teacher reports of high parental interest in the school and low crime rate in the school.

Question 8. Why do high schools differ in damage rates and/or have a higher rate of disturbances/acts of violence?

Over 50 percent of the teacher responses in Appendix C-8 indicated that neighborhood and student attitude was the cause for the differences in damage rates and/or the higher rate of disturbances/acts of violence. The remainder of the responses were distributed uniformly between facilities, staff attitude and administration.

Question 9. How should vandalism and disturbances/ acts of violence on the high school campus be handled?

When asked in what ways vandalism and violence should be handled on the school campus, teacher responses were evenly distributed. The data in Appendix C-9 indicated that joint efforts of the teacher, administration, security and police was the way they felt discipline should be handled. No teacher responded to the effect that these acts should be ignored.

Question 10. What might be a solution to the problems of vandalism and violence on your campus?

The data in Appendix C-10 seemed to indicate that a larger percent of respondents felt that more discipline, security and expulsion might be the solutions to the problems of vandalism and violence.

Question 11. How might the teacher-teacher contacts in your school be described?

Many teachers who responded indicated more than one type of teacher-teacher contact in their school. It was hypothesized that there might be more professional as well as intrapersonal contacts among teachers in schools of low crime rate than in others. In evaluating the data, "planned social" and "unplanned social" were grouped together. The findings in Appendix C-11 indicate a high positive correlation (.84) between high crime rate schools and the high percent of minimal teacher-teacher contacts. Teachers in low crime rate schools reported a high percent of professional and social teacher-teacher contacts.

Question 12. How might the principal-teacher contacts in your school be described?

Slightly more than half of the responding teachers characterized their principal as having an "open door" policy, while about 30 percent reported that interviews could be initiated informally by the teacher or by the principal. The data presented in Appendix C-12 shows no association between high crime rate schools and the mode of principal-teacher contact. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was .08.

Question 13. What is your evaluation of student attitude toward your school?

Asked to evaluate student attitude toward the school, teachers reported that 32.5 percent had a casual feeling about the school. Appendix C-13 shows a positive correlation (.44) between high crime rate schools and student attitudes of resentment and indifference. This might be an implication that students in low crime rate schools are more apt to be enthusiastic and respectful of their school.

Question 14. What is your evaluation of teacher attitude toward your school?

A high positive correlation (.69) between high crime rate schools and teacher attitudes of indifference and destructively critical attitudes was computed for the data in Appendix C-14. Only slightly more than 20 percent of the respondents reported that teachers were enthusiastic about their schools. However, the lower the crime rate, the more frequent the expression of enthusiasm for the school.

Question 15. In your opinion, what is the responsibility of teachers in matters of maintaining discipline?

Almost 70 percent of the teacher respondents felt that teachers were responsible in matters of maintaining discipline anywhere on campus (Appendix C-15).

Question 16. What type of administration exists at your school?

In Appendix C-16 it can be seen that slightly more than 75 percent of the responses indicated that the principal was democratic, strong and strict. The remainder of the responses indicated that the principal was casual or weak. The data shows a positive correlation (.41) between high crime rate schools and administrations that are characterized as permissive, indifferent or weak. Teachers in low crime rate schools reported their administration as strong and/or democratic, even rigid.

Question 17. Does your school have a written policy for the handling of discipline problems?

Appendix C-17 shows that only 4.7 percent of the teacher respondents claimed no knowledge of a written discipline policy in their school.

Question 18. In what way does your principal enforce school rules or policies?

The positive correlation (.45) existing between the lack of enforcement of school rules or policies and high crime rate schools is shown in Appendix C-18. Responding teachers in low crime rate schools reported that their principals vigorously enforce school rules and policies.

Question 19. What best describes your principal's actions in maintaining school discipline?

The findings in Appendix C-19 indicated an association between the principal's inconsistent or unpredictable manner of action in maintaining school discipline and high crime rate schools. Almost 40 percent of the teachers responding reported their principal's actions as fair, while low crime rate school respondents tended to report firm and consistent actions with regards to administrative maintenance of school discipline.

Question 20. What standards are set by your principal for your school?

The teachers were asked to appraise the standards set by their principals. Appendix C-20 shows a positive correlation (.45) between low standards of the school and high crime rate schools. Low crime rate school respondents reported exclusively high and above average standards being set for their schools.

Question 21. Would you say that the principal is interested in the welfare of both teachers and students at your school?

Data presented in Appendix C-21 shows an association between high crime rate schools and principals' lack of interest in the welfare of both teachers and students. Teachers in low crime rate schools reported that principals were interested in their welfare, as well as that of the students.

Question 22. In what way does the principal support teachers in matters of discipline?

It was hypothesized that a lack of teacher support in matters of discipline could be correlated with high crime rate schools. This hypothesis was corroborated by the data in Appendix C-22. The correlation indicated an association between teacher reports of the principal being supportive and low crime rate in the school.

Question 23. How would you describe your school-community relations?

As can be seen in Appendix C-23, a positive correlation (.52) existed between the lack of school-community relations and high crime rate schools. Over 20 percent of the teachers responding indicated almost a complete lack of school-community relations. The data indicated the suggestion of an association between extensive or considerable school-community relations and low crime rate in the school.

Question 24. Please write one short sentence (more if you desire) stating what you believe would help most in improving discipline in your school.

When teachers were asked to state what they believed would help most in improving discipline at their school, a variety of opinions were offered. The data in Appendix C-24 indicated that there was no distinction between the responses of teachers in high crime rate schools, and those in schools of low crime rate. Almost 25 percent of the respondents felt that more parental and community involvement was needed. Slightly more than 10 percent of the teachers advocated that everyone, the school, the family and the community, work together. Almost 25 percent of the teacher respondents held the opinion that to improve discipline the administration must institute rules, consistently enforce them, cooperate and support the teachers in matters of discipline. Examples of "other" answers cited were as follows: "an end to the 'Employer-Employee' syndrome," "realistic standards," "smaller schools," and "the expulsion of hard-core elements."

Summary

Presented here have been the results of the analyzed data obtained from teacher questionnaires that pertained to matters of discipline in 19 high schools that were surveyed on the island of Oahu in the state of Hawaii. All teachers surveyed indicated a concern about the problems of vandalism and violence on the high school campus, and almost every teacher was aware of such problems on their campus. A variety of reasons were presented by the teachers for property damage, and disturbances/acts of violence, with over half of the responses referring to the students and to the community. The data on motivations attributed to student vandalism and violence appeared to be uniformly distributed between boredom, fun, status, attention, and resentment. There was a suggestion by teachers that unstable home conditions, low ability and low socioeconomic background of the student were significant factors in cases of vandalism and violence.

Although most of the teachers in the survey seem to have had little contact with the parents of their students, about one-quarter of the teachers reported more than a casual acquaintance with parents. Teachers in low crime rate schools reported high parental interest in the school, however, over half of the teachers surveyed interpreted the parents' attitude toward the school as being unaware or indifferent. Schools were considered to vary in amount of vandalism and violence primarily because of neighborhood and student attitude. A joint effort by the teacher, administration, security personnel and police was the method teachers felt should be used to handle discipline problems. More discipline, security and expulsion were presented as solutions to the problems of vandalism and violence.

Contacts between teachers were more limited in high crime rate schools than in others. Teacher contacts in low rate crime schools tended to be both professional and social in nature. More than half of the teacher respondents reported their principal had an "open door" policy, while about one-third of the teachers reported that interviews could be initiated informally by the teacher or by the principal. Students in high crime rate schools tended to have attitudes of resentment and indifference, while teacher attitudes of indifference, and those who were destructively critical, were associated with these schools. In low crime rate schools teachers and students were described as being enthusiastic about the school, with students holding it in respect.

A majority of the teachers surveyed felt that teachers should be responsible in matters of maintaining discipline anywhere on campus. In low crime rate schools the administration was characterized as strong and/or democratic, even rigid. High crime rate schools were associated with administrations that were reported as permissive, indifferent or weak. All schools had written discipline policies, however, there seemed to be a lack of enforcement of these policies in high crime rate schools.

The principal tended to set high or above average standards in low crime rate schools, while low standards seemed to exist in high crime rate schools. Teachers in high crime schools tended to interpret a lack of interest in the welfare of students and teachers on the part of the principal, as well as a lack of support in matters of discipline. An association was drawn between high crime rate schools and a lack of school-community relations. Of the variety of suggestions to improve discipline, most teachers felt that more parental and community involvement was needed, that everyone should work together, and that the administration should institute rules, consistently enforce them, cooperate and support the teachers in matters of discipline.

Student Respondents and Schools

The purpose of this section was to present the results of the student survey designed to probe matters of discipline in the high school. A questionnaire was administered to a sample of 430 eleventh grade students in 19 high schools, or five percent of the students in each school. Certain questions were designed to obtain a general impression of the make-up/climate of the school, while the remainder of the questions were designed to test for a correlation between high crime schools and certain behavior.

Information from Respondents

Question 1. Why do you attend school?

The data presented in Appendix D-1 shows slightly more than 50 percent of the respondents reported they intend to go to college. Only 13.9 percent of the students reported that they attended school because it was compulsory, or because the student had "nothing else to do."

Question 2. How do you feel your school compares with other schools?

Slightly less than half the students replied that their school was "equal to" other schools. Only 11.9 percent reported that their school was poorer than most, or the poorest of those they knew. However, the data in Appendix D-2 shows a positive correlation (.44) between low student attitudes about their schools and high crime rate schools. The correlation suggests the association of low crime rate in the school, and students who hold their school in high esteem.

Question 3. How do your parents feel about your school?

It was hypothesized that a positive correlation could be shown between high crime rate schools and unfavorable or critical attitudes on the part of parents. This hypothesis was not corroborated by the data in Appendix D-3 and no association was shown between high crime rate schools and negative parental attitudes. However, the data suggests a relatively high proportion of parents are non-committal in their attitude toward the school.

Question 4: Do you think your parents are interested in the school?

Slightly more than 45 percent of the students felt that their parents were either indifferent, disinterested, or rejecting toward the school. However, the association between high crime rate schools and unfavorable parental attitudes, indicated in Appendix D-4, is statistically too low to be considered significant.

Question 5. Do students have a part in planning school programs?

In Appendix D-5 it can be seen that slightly more than half the responses indicated that students meet regularly with the principal or initiate school programs. Only 7.7 percent of the respondents indicated that in their school, students were allowed no voice in school affairs. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was .13, which shows no association between low participation in planning school programs and high crime rate schools at the .05 level.

Question 6. What do you do about extra-curricular activities?

The degree of participation of students in extracurricular activities was not correlated with crime rate of the school. Neither a high proportion of leaders nor of isolates appeared associated with crime rate of the school. The data are presented in Appendix D-6.

Question 7. How do students feel about your principal?

Over 65 percent of the students indicated that they respected, or greatly admired their principal. However, the data in Appendix D-7 indicated a positive correlation (.44) between students who reported their principal lax and weak, and high crime rate schools. On the other hand, low crime rate schools appeared to be associated with feelings of respect and admiration for the principal on the part of the students.

Question 8. How do you feel about the counselors in your school?

It can be seen in Appendix D-8 that about two-thirds of the student respondents indicated that the school counselor was interested and helpful with student problems, academic and otherwise. The remainder felt that the counselor was only mildly interested in aiding students, or acted as a disciplinarian. In 10.4 percent of the responses the students reported that the function of the counselor was not known. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was .00 which shows no association between responses unfavorable to the counselor and high crime rate schools at the .05 level.

Question 9. How strict are your teachers?

About 85 percent of the students felt that their teachers were neither too mild nor too strict. The findings in Appendix D-9 indicated the correlation value for this question was below the criterion for acceptance in this test.

Question 10. Does your school have a statement on student rights and responsibilities?

The Department of Education has adopted a "Student Rights and Responsibilities Statement" covering all schools in the state of Hawaii. It is interesting to note (Appendix D-10) that almost 35 percent of the students in this study had no knowledge of this instrument.

Question 11. Does your school have a written policy for handling discipline problems?

Data in Appendix D-11 shows over 40 percent of the student respondents claimed no knowledge of a written discipline policy in their school.

Question 12. What do you do when you see a student damaging school property?

It was hypothesized that a correlation could be demonstrated between high crime schools and lack of student action. The data in Appendix D-12 shows 34 percent of the students merely talk about observed criminal action on the school campus, while 32 percent walk away and tell no one. However, the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient showed no correlation between high crime rate schools and students who only talk about and walk away from observed criminal action and contribute to the action itself.

Question 13. How would you describe the bathroom facilities at your school?

Although student smoking on the school campus is prohibited by law in Hawaii, most high schools are plagued with the problem of students smoking in the bathrooms. Fighting in bathrooms has also been a particularly nettling issue in the high schools in Hawaii. Appendix D-13 presents data showing a positive correlation (.44) between more serious problems with bathroom facilities, and high crime rate schools. Students reported incidents of fighting that prohibit use or cautious use of the bathroom facilities.

Question 14. To what extent are drugs (pot and pills) a problem at your school?

It was felt that a positive correlation could be provided between drug use and high crime rate schools. The data in Appendix D-14 did not support this contention. No association could be established between extensive use of drugs and high crime rate schools. Students answering the questionnaire may not have been completely honest in answering this question. Many penned messages to this question remarked, "none of your business," or words to this effect. These findings are clearly not consistent with what was expected.

Question 15. How would you describe the student-teacher relationship at your school?

Sixty percent of the students felt that most of their teachers were respected, while slightly more than 30 percent reported students "hassle" some of the teachers. Data provided in Appendix D-15 showed a positive correlation (.40) between high crime rate schools and student lack of respect for teachers and trouble in the classroom. Teachers in low crime rate schools appear to be more respected than those in other schools.

Question 16. Why do students damage school property and/or create disturbances/indulge in acts of violence on the school campus?

When students were asked to indicate reasons for violence and vandalism on the school campus, responses appeared to be distributed uniformly. The data are exhibited in Appendix D-16. More than one response was given by several students. Percentages were based on the total number of responses to each category.

Question 17. What do you feel might be a solution to the problem of vandalism and violence on the high school campus?

It was noted from Appendix D-17, when students were asked for solutions to the problem of violence and vandalism on the school campus, their responses were distributed relatively even for each category. Again, several students noted more than one answer.

Summary

This section presented the results of analyzed data obtained from student questionnaires pertaining to matters of discipline in surveyed high schools on the island of Oahu in the state of Hawaii. Slightly more than one-half of the students surveyed reported intentions of going to college. Although almost one-half of the respondents felt their school was equal to other schools, a positive correlation was established between students who have a low evaluation of their school and high crime rate schools. However, no association was indicated between negative parental attitudes and high crime rate schools.

One-half of the responses indicated that students meet regularly with the principal or initiate school programs. No association was shown between low participation in planning school programs and high crime rate schools, nor was participation of students in extra-curricular activities correlated with crime rate of the school.

Although 65 percent of the students indicated that they respected or greatly admired their principal, a positive correlation was found between students who reported their principal lax and weak and high crime rate schools. Questions concerning counselors and teachers indicated no association between responses unfavorable to the counselor or teacher and high crime rate schools.

Thirty-five percent of the students surveyed had no knowledge of the "Student Rights and Responsibilities Statement" promulgated by the State of Hawaii Department of Education, and over 40 percent of the respondents claimed no knowlege of a written discipline policy in their school.

Although 65 percent of the students indicated that they just talk about observed criminal action or walk away from it, no correlation was established between these behaviors and high crime rate schools. However, a positive correlation was shown between problems of fighting in bathrooms and high crime rate schools. No association was found between extensive use of drugs and high crime rate schools.

A positive correlation was shown between high crime rate schools and student lack of respect for teachers and trouble in the classroom. Responses to questions concerning reasons for violence and vandalism on the school campus and solutions to these problems appeared to be distributed uniformly.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present an overview of the entire study; to restate the problem, sources of data, methods employed, and conclusions and recommendations derived from the study.

The study was undertaken in order to determine the type of discipline problems a high school principal must be prepared to handle, to discover methods currently being used in dealing with discipline problems, to examine school characteristics that may be associated with discipline problems, to ascertain from principals their views regarding the degree of support they receive from their superiors, from staff members, from parents and from the community, and through a questionnaire approach, demonstrate the influence principals hold in the area of discipline.

The data were obtained from principals, teachers, and students in 19 public high schools on the island of Oahu in the state of Hawaii. Data were gathered from principals by means of an interview, while questionnaires were used to gather data from teachers and students. The interview instrument and questionnaires were devised to elicit both factual and subjective responses.

Analysis of the data was performed using data-processing equipment and standardized techniques for the computation of percentages and determination of the significance of differences.

Summary of Findings

The research accomplished in this study revealed the following findings:

1. A positive correlation was established between the school's population and crime rate. In testing the association between the school's population and crime rate, the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used. A coefficient correlation of .66 was computed, which verified a positive correlation between these measures. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to establish the validity of the hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The data was presented in Appendix B-1.

2. No association was found between school-community relations and crime rate in principal responses. However, in teacher responses a positive correlation was indicated between high crime rate schools and the lack of school-community relations.

3. The trend in principal responses indicated little interest or just passable participation on the part of parents in high crime rate schools and meddlesome and resentful parents. The correlation suggested an association between high parental interest in the school and low crime rate in the school. No association was indicated in student responses between negative parental attitude and high crime rate schools, although almost 50 percent of the students felt that their parents were either indifferent, disinterested or rejecting toward the school.

4. According to principal responses, most teachers were doing their fair share of maintaining discipline in the classroom, but there

was a concern about the small percentage of teachers who were not cooperating. Teacher responses indicated that almost 70 percent of the respondents felt that teachers should be responsible in maintaining discipline anywhere on campus.

5. All principals felt that they had the necessary support from their superiors in matters dealing with discipline.

6. All principals stated that rules and regulations of their schools were published in both student and teacher handbooks. However, about 5 percent of the teacher respondents and 40 percent of the student respondents claimed no knowledge of a written discipline policy in their school.

7. Although the school parking lot and off-campus areas adjacent to the school were cited as "trouble spots," discipline problems occurred most frequently in school bathrooms and isolated areas. Student responses indicated a positive correlation between more serious problems with bathroom facilities and high crime rate schools.

8. According to the majority of principals, the most serious/costly discipline problems occurred at night and/or on week-ends.

9. Principals reported truancy as the problem that occurred most frequently. Burglary, vandalism, smoking and drug use occurred both occasionally and frequently, while fighting and disorderly conduct occurred with moderate frequency. Principals reported eight teachers had been assaulted by students in the past year. Brush fires and fires in trash receptacles were problems in almost one-half of the schools represented. More than one-half of the principals reported significant fires/arson at their schools in the past year.

10. All schools had incorporated some type(s) of special program(s) in the effort to combat discipline problems.

11. Although almost one-half of the principals felt no restrictions in their position of authority in dealing with matters of discipline, a trend in principal responses indicated that principals felt hampered by student rights and paper work with regard to Rule 21 in high or medium high crime rate schools. Some principals felt hindered by the teacher union and the lack of alternative programs for hard-core cases.

12. Principals evaluated the status of discipline as follows: 65 percent believed that discipline problems were decreasing, 24 percent felt that they had remained the same, while only one principal stated that discipline problems were increasing.

13. In the opinion of principals, the extent of discipline problems is determined by the following: style of leadership, committed staff, socioeconomic level of the community, community support or community values, and student attitudes and values. Over one-half of the teachers felt that the neighborhood and student attitude accounted for the differences in the extent of discipline problems. The remainder of teacher responses cited facilities, staff attitude and administration.

14. According to principal responses, the key to good school discipline was categorized as follows: teachers, teamwork, pride and fair and humane treatment of students.

15. All teachers were concerned about the problem of vandalism and violence on the school campus.

16. Over 80 percent of the teachers were aware of the problems of vandalism and violence on their school campus.

17. Over 50 percent of the teachers blamed students and community for property damage and disturbances/acts of violence on their campus. The remainder of teacher responses cited administration, teachers and facilities, along with "parents," "society" and "outsiders."

18. Both teachers and students reported that vandalism and violence stemmed from boredom, fun, status, attention and resentment.

19. The majority of teachers felt that students involved in vandalism and/or creating disturbances/indulging in acts of violence could be characterized as follows: High school boys, of low ability, with unstable home conditions/low socioeconomic background.

20. In the opinion of teachers, discipline problems should be handled jointly by teachers, administration, security and police.

21. A majority of teachers believed that more discipline, security and expulsion might be solutions to problems of vandalism and violence. Student responses appeared evenly distributed between more discipline, more activities, a change in the

curriculum, security and expulsion.

22. Teacher responses indicated a positive correlation between high crime rate schools and minimal teacher-teacher contacts.

23. Over one-half of the teachers reported their principal had an "open door" policy, while 30 percent stated that interviews could be initiated informally by the teacher or by the principal.

24. One-third of the teachers rated student attitude toward the school as casual. According to teacher responses a positive correlation was indicated between high crime rate schools and student attitudes of resentment and indifference. Student responses also indicated a positive correlation between high crime rate schools and negative student attitudes.

25. Teacher responses indicated a positive correlation between high crime rate schools and teacher attitudes of indifference and destructively critical attitudes.

26. Teacher responses indicated a positive correlation between high crime rate schools and permissive, indifferent or weak administrators. Teachers in low crime rate schools reported their administrators as strong and/or democratic, even rigid. Students in high crime rate schools reported their principal to be lax and weak, while in low crime rate schools the students indicated respect and admiration for the principal.

27. Teacher responses indicated a positive correlation between the lack of enforcement of school rules and policies and high crime rate schools. Teachers in low crime rate schools reported their principals vigorously enforce school rules and policies.

28. According to teacher responses, an association existed between the principal's inconsistent and unpredictable manner of action in maintaining school discipline and high crime rate schools. Teachers in low crime rate schools tended to report firm and consistent actions with regards to administrative maintenance of school discipline.

29. Teacher responses indicated principals in high crime rate schools set low standards for their school, while above average or high standards were set by principals in low crime rate schools.

30. Teachers reported a lack of interest on the part of the principal in the welfare of both teachers and students in high crime rate schools.

31. The high crime rate schools teachers reported a lack of support from the principal, while in low crime rate schools teachers indicated the principal was supportive.

32. Teachers stated that to improve discipline, more parental and community involvement is needed, that everyone, the school, the family and the community should work together, and that the administration should institute rules, consistently enforce them, cooperate and support the teachers in matters of discipline.

33. About one-half of the student responses indicated that students met regularly with the principal or initiated school programs.

34. The degree of participation in extra-curricular activities was not correlated with crime rate of the school.

35. About two-thirds of the student responses indicated that counselors were interested and helpful with student problems. The remaining students felt that counselors were only mildly interested in aiding students, or acted as a disciplinarian. Ten percent of the students did not know the function of the counselor.

36. About 85 percent of the students felt that their teachers were neither too mild nor too strict.

37. One-third of the students had no knowledge of the "Student Rights and Responsibilities Statement" adopted by the Department of Education.

38. Although 65 percent of the students indicated that they just talk to their friends about observed criminal action or walk away from it, no association could be demonstrated between high crime schools and lack of student action.

39. Student responses indicated no association between extensive use of drugs and high crime rate schools.

40. Student responses indicated a positive correlation between high crime rate schools and the lack of respect for teachers and trouble in the classroom.

Conclusions

Based upon this study the following conclusions were defensible:

1. The hypothesis that high schools in which principals exert strong leadership have fewer discipline problems than high schools in which principal leadership is weak was substantiated by this study.

2. The hypothesis that high school principals who set high standards for their school have fewer discipline problems than those principals who do not was substantiated by this investigation.

3. The hypothesis that high schools in which principals have established clear-cut rules and regulations and vigorously enforce school policies will have fewer discipline problems than high schools in which principals do not consistently enforce school policy and have ambiguous rules and regulations was substantiated in part by the findings of this study. All schools publish their rules and regulations in both student and teacher handbooks. However, principals who vigorously enforce school policies, displaying firm and consistent actions, have fewer discipline problems than principals who are inconsistent and unpredictable in the enforcement of school policy.

4. The hypothesis that where high school principals maintain healthy and extensive school-community relations, discipline problems are fewer than in those high schools where little school-community relations exist was supported by the findings of the teacher survey. This hypothesis was not substantiated by the survey of principals.

5. The hypothesis that high schools where teachers feel the principal is supportive have fewer discipline problems than those high schools where teachers feel that the principal does not and/or will not support them was substantiated by this study.

6. The hypothesis that school discipline is affected adversely when the principal feels that he or she does not have sufficient authority to deal effectively with discipline problems was substantiated by this investigation. Although all

principals feel that they have the necessary support of their superiors, high schools in which principals feel hampered by student rights and paper work with regards to Rule 21 have more discipline problems than those schools in which principals feel little or no restrictions in their position of authority.

7. The hypothesis that discipline problems vary in kind and degree in high schools, according to the size of the school was substantiated in part by the findings in this study. High schools with a large number of students have more discipline problems than high schools of lesser population, however, all schools encounter basically the same types of discipline problems.

8. The hypothesis that discipline problems vary in kind and degree in high schools, depending upon the socioeconomic level of the community was not substantiated by this study.

9. The hypothesis that the extent to which parents support the high school affects the frequency of discipline problems in that school was substantiated by this investigation. High schools that have considerable or extensive parental cooperation have fewer discipline problems than those high schools in which parents are disinterested or indifferent.

10. High schools in which a high percentage of teacher-teacher contacts is professional and social have fewer discipline problems than high schools in which teacher-teacher contacts are minimal.

11. High schools in which teachers express enthusiasm for the school have fewer discipline problems than high schools in which teachers are indifferent and/or are destructively critical about the school.

12. High schools in which students are enthusiastic and respectful of their school have fewer discipline problems than high schools in which students display attitudes of resentment and indifference.

13. High schools in which teachers are respected have fewer discipline problems than high schools in which students lack respect for teachers.

14. High schools in which the principal is interested in the welfare of the students and teachers have fewer discipline problems than high

schools in which the principal has little interest in the welfare of both teachers and students.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. Principals institute above average or high academic and behavior expectations and standards for the school.

2. Principals review, and if necessary, revise the existing rules and regulations of their schools and conscientiously disseminate, promulgate, and vigorously enforce these policies in a uniform and consistent manner.

3. A strong program of public relations be directed to parents and community to enlist their interest and cooperation with the school.

4. Principals in large high schools, in communities where parental cooperation is less than satisfactory, and in schools that require a disproportionate amount of administrative time for the handling of behavior problems be given additional assistance of counselors, security personnel, child welfare and attendance personnel so that the principal may be freed to devote his major energies to the improvement of the educational program.

5. Alternative schools/programs be inaugurated to deal with hard-core offenders.

6. Since discipline problems occur most frequently in school bathrooms, principals schedule more adequate supervision of this area than is now practiced.

7. Everything possible be done to interpret to parents the role of the school in matters of discipline and the part they must play and their responsibility as parents in teaching their children proper respect and attitudes of good citizenship.

8. Principals adopt positive attitudes in the promotion and development of bonds between the various members of the school family.

9. Interpersonal relations in the school be structured so as to increase identification of teachers, students and parents, with the school. Contacts, formal and informal, should be stimulated for better understanding of the goals of the school.

10. Principals consider the welfare of students and teachers along with the formal task of education. The principal should be concerned with the comfort and happiness, as well as the development of intellects, of both students and teachers.

11. Principals seek ways to transmit to the students the particular value the school represents, that of education.

12. Principals take a more positive approach in communicating to all students their rights, emphasizing their responsibilities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

1. Anderson, Lester W. and Lauren A. Van Dyke. Secondary School Administration. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972.

2. Austin, David B., Will French and Dan J. Hull. American High School Administration. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

3. Bent, Rudyard K. and Lloyd E. McCann. Administration of Secondary Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.

4. Burrup, Percy E. Modern High School Administration. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962.

5. Dobson, James. Dare to Discipline. New York: Bantam Books, 1970.

6. Douglass, Harl R. Modern Administration of Secondary Schools. New York: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1963.

7. Gorton, Richard A. Conflict, Controversy and Crisis in School Administration and Supervision: Issues, Cases and Concepts for the 70's. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1972.

8. Keniston, Kenneth. Youth and Dissent. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1971.

9. Larson, Knute. School Discipline in an Age of Rebellion. New York: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1972.

10. Linder, Ivan H. and Henry M. Gunn. Secondary School Administration: Problems and Practices. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1963.

11. Ovard, Glen F. Administration of the Changing Secondary School. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.

12. Raubinger, Frederick M., Merle R. Sumption, and Richard M. Kamm. Leadership in the Secondary School. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1974.

13. Reich, Charles A. The Greening of America. New York: Random House, 1970.

14. Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Random House, 1970.

15. Vredevoe, Lawrence. Discipline. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1971.

16. Weaver, Donald C. "Competent Leadership for an Explosive Era." In The Secondary School Principal In Action, pp. 49-58. Edited by Leonard E. Kraft. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1971.

17. Williams, Stanley W. Educational Administration in Secondary Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Periodical Articles

18. Ackerly, Robert L. "Reactions to The Reasonable Exercise of Authority," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, February 1971, pp. 1-12.

19. "America's Youth," U.S. News & World Report, 18 July 1977, pp. 18-20.

20. Anrig, Gregory R. "Those High School Protestors: Can Boards Put Up With Much More?" American School Board Journal, October 1969, pp. 20-24.

21. Anson, Ronald J. "The Educator's Response to Goss and Wood," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1975, pp. 16-19.

22. Brothers, W. Richard. "Procedural Due Process: What Is It?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, January 1975, pp. 1-8.

23. Cereghino, Edward J. "Administrator: Target for Today," The Clearing House, May 1971, pp. 528-31.

24. Childs, Harold. "Schools and Student Rights: The Attitudinal Lag," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, February 1976, pp. 71-73.

25. Cole, James E. "What to Do about Violence," Today's Education, November-December 1977, pp. 58-59.

26. Dalrymple, William. "The Revolution is Over: How It Changed Us," University: A Princeton Quarterly, Winter 1972, pp. 1-32.

27. DeWitt, Gerald. "School Conflict Engulfs the School Principal," North Central Association Quarterly, Spring 1971, pp. 349-55.

28. Efron, Edith. "Does TV Violence Affect Our Society? NO," TV Guide, 14 June 1975, pp. 22-28.

29. Erickson, Kenneth A. "Disruptive Youth--How They Waste the Minds of Millions," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, February 1976, pp. 44-47.

30. Ferguson, James E. "Due Process--Is Now," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, February 1973, pp. 95-99.

31. Gallup, George. "The Public Looks at the Public Schools," Today's Education, September-October 1975, pp. 16-20.

32. George, Thomas W. "Upheaval in School Law," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, May 1973, pp. 118-26.

33. Goldstein, William. "Discipline: For Someone Else's Kid?" The Clearing House, April 1973, pp. 455-58.

34. ________. "Will the Real American High School Please Stand Up!" The American High School, September 1976, pp. 4-10.

35. Griffiths, William E. "Student Constitutional Rights: The Role of the Principal," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, September 1968, pp. 30-37.

36. Hickey, Neil. "Does TV Violence Affect Our Society? YES," TV Guide, 14 June 1975, pp. 8-18.

37. Irwin, James R. "Vandalism--Its Prevention and Control," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, May 1976, pp. 55-59.

38. Johnson, T. Page. "The Constitution, the Courts, and Long Hair," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, April 1973, pp. 24-33.

39. Landers, Thomas J. and Robert S. Silverman. "It's the Principal of the Thing," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, September 1974, pp. 45-47.

40. McKenna, Bernard. "Student Unrest: Some Causes and Cures," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, February 1971, pp. 54-60.

41. McNassor, Donald. "Decision Making Process in a Revolution," Journal of Secondary Education 44 (October 1969): 265-70.

42. Murdock, George. "School Tackles Discipline Problems with a Smile," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, November 1973, pp. 88-90.

43. Olson, Eric. "Student Rights--Locker Searches," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, February 1971, pp. 46-53.

44. Richardson, Don H. "Combating Vandalism in the Schools," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, May 1976, pp. 60-65.

45. Thomas, M. Donald. "Let's Talk Sense about Discipline," The Clearing House, March 1977, pp. 309-12.

46. Thomson, Scott D. "An Overview of Activism," North Central Association Quarterly, Spring 1969, pp. 335-41.

47. Thorum, Reho F. "Codifying Student Rights and Responsibilities," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, January 1975, pp. 9-13.

48. Van Avery, Dennis. "Contrasting Solutions for School Violence: II. The Humanitarian Approach," Phi Delta Kappan, November 1975, pp. 177-78.

49. "Violence in Schools," U.S. News & World Report, 14 April 1975, pp. 37-40.

50. Von Brock, Robert C. "Coping with Suspension and the Supreme Court," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, March 1977, pp. 68-76.

51. Wint, Joseph. "Contrasting Solutions for School Violence: I. The Crackdown," Phi Delta Kappan, November 1975, pp. 175-76.

Publications of Educational Organizations

52. Ackerly, Robert L. *The Reasonable Exercise of Authority*. Washington: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1969.

53. Ackerly, Robert L. and Ivan B. Gluckman. *The Reasonable Exercise of Authority, II*. Reston, Virginia: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1976.

54. Berger, Michael L. *Violence in the Schools; Causes and Remedies*. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1974.

55. Chaffee, John Jr. "This We Propose . . ." *New Dimensions for Educating Youth*. Denver, Colorado: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1976, pp. 1-2.

56. Cuban, Larry. *Youth As a Minority*. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1972.

57. *Evaluation of the School Security Patrol Pilot Project*. Department of Education, State of Hawaii, Office of the Superintendent, January 1976.

58. Hamilton, Robert R. *Legal Rights and Liabilities of Teachers*. Laramie, Wyoming: Laramie Printers, 1956.

59. Howard, Eugene R. and John M. Jenkins. *Improving Discipline in the Secondary School. A Catalogue of Alternatives to Repression. An Occasional Paper*. Denver, Colorado: CFK, Ltd., 1970.

60. Jones, J. William. *Discipline Crisis in Schools: The Problem, Causes and Search for Solutions*. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association, 1973.

61. Kleeman, Richard P. *Students Rights and Responsibilities*. Washington: National School Public Relations Association, 1972.

62. Neill, Shirley Boes. *Violence and Vandalism: Current Trends in School Policies and Programs*. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association, 1975.

63. Part II. Rules for Department Operations, Rule 21. Relating to Student Discipline, Docket 27, _Rules of the Department of Education_. Department of Education, State of Hawaii, Revised 21 April 1976.

64. _A Plan to Improve School and Library Environments_. Office of Planning and Budget/Planning Services Branch, Department of Education, State of Hawaii, March 1976.

65. "Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities," _Departmental Rules of the Department of Education_. Department of Education, State of Hawaii, 1977.

66. Walch, J. Weston and Robert W. Donovan. _School Unrest_. Portland, Maine: J. Weston Walch, Publisher, 1970.

67. "Who's to Blame?" _National Education Association Reporter_, February, 1976, p. 5.

68. Woodman, Kathleen. "Dealing with Vandalism." _New Dimensions for Educating Youth_. Denver, Colorado: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1976, pp. 31-32.

Newspaper Articles

69. "Compulsion and Schools," Santa Ana (California) _Register_, 20 June 1975, p. E4.

70. "Discipline Seen as Worst School Problem," _Los Angeles Times_, 2 October 1977, Sec. I, p. 28.

71. "DOE Urged to Tally Incidences of Violence," _Honolulu Star-Bulletin_, 9 January 1978, p. A13.

72. Gereben, Janos. "School Violence Soars," _Honolulu Star-Bulletin_, 3 February 1976, p. A7.

73. Kaser, Tom. "Diversity and Problems Directly Related," _Honolulu Advertiser_, 1 January 1976, p. A1.

74. ________. "Unrest Laid to Less Than 5% of Students," _Honolulu Star-Bulletin & Advertiser_, 6 June 1976, p. A3.

75. ________. "What's Needed, as Some Teachers See It," _Honolulu Advertiser_, 9 June 1976, p. A1.

76. Kerby, Phil. "Schools Are Not a Place for Ruffians," Honolulu Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, 26 February 1978, p. E2.

77. Michaels, Marguerite. "Our Nation's Teachers Are Taking a Beating," Parade, 26 February 1978, pp. 6-7.

78. "'Prison-Like Schools' Concern Educators," Honolulu Star-Bulletin, 17 December 1975, p. A10.

79. "Schools and Discipline," Honolulu Advertiser, 7 June 1977, p. A8.

80. "Schools' Role in Student Violence Told," Honolulu Star-Bulletin, 15 December 1975, p. A9.

81. Schreibman, Jack. "An Era of Campus Calm," Honolulu Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, 25 September 1977, pp. C3-4.

82. "Violence in Schools," Honolulu Advertiser, 13 June 1976, p. A11.

83. Wallace, Louise H. "Teacher Airs School Problems," Honolulu Star-Bulletin, 17 February 1977, p. A19.

Legal Cases

84. Aguirre v. Tahoka Independent School District, 311 F.Supp. 664 (N.D.Tex.1970)

85. Baker v. Owen, 423 U.S. 907 (1975)

86. Blackwell v. Issaquena County Board of Education, 363 F.2d 749 (5th Cir. 1966)

87. Burnside v. Byars, 363 F.2d 744 (5th Cir. 1966)

88. Carter v. Hodges, 317 F.Supp. 89 (W.D.Ark.1970)

89. Davis v. Ferment 269 F.Supp. 524 (1967)

90. Dunn v. Tyler Independent School District, 327 F.Supp. 528 (D.C.E.D.Tex.1971)

91. Eisner v. Stamford Board of Education, 314 F.Supp. 832 (1970)

92. Eisner v. Stamford Board of Education, 440 F.2d 803 (1971)

93. *Fujishima* v. *Board of Education*, 460 F.2d 1355 (1972)

94. *Giangreco* v. *Center School District*, 313 F.Supp. 776 (W.D.Mo.1969)

95. *Goss* v. *Lopez*, 419 U.S. 565 (1975)

96. *Hernandez* v. *School District Number One*, 315 F.Supp. 289 (1970)

97. *In re Gault*, 387 U.S. 1 (1967)

98. *Lander* v. *Seaver*, 32 Vt. 114, 122-23 (1859)

99. *Leonard* v. *School Committee in Attleboro*, 349 Mass. 704, 212 N.E.2d 468 (1965)

100. *Myers* v. *Arcata Union High School District*, 75 Cal. Rptr. 68 (Super.Ct.Cal. 1966)

101. *People* v. *Overton*, 249, N.E.2d 366 (1969)

102. *Pugsley* v. *Sellmeyer*, 158 Ark. 247, 250 S.W. 538 (1923)

103. *Quarterman* v. *Byrd*, 453 F.2d 54 (1971)

104. *Richards* v. *Thurston*, 424 F.2d 1281 (1st Cir. 1970)

105. *Schwartz* v. *Schuker*, 298 F.Supp. 238 (1969)

106. *Scoville* v. *Board of Education*, 286 F.Supp. 988 (1968)

107. *Scoville* v. *Board of Education*, 415 F.2d 860 (1969)

108. *Scoville* v. *Board of Education*, 425 F.2d 10 (7th Cir.), cert. denied, 400 U.S. 826, 91 S.Ct. 51, 27 L.Ed.2d 55 (1970)

109. *Shanley* v. *Northeast Independent School District*, 462 F.2d 1960 (1972)

110. *Sullivan* v. *Houston Independent School District*, 307 F.Supp. 1328, 1340 (S.D.Tex.1969)

111. *Tinker* v. *Des Moines Independent Community School District*, 393 U.S. 503 (1969)

112. *Ware* v. *Estes*, 328 F.Supp. 657 (N.D.Tex.1972)

113. *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943)

114. Wood v. Strickland, 420 U.S. 308 (1975)

Unpublished Materials

115. Hawaii Federation of Teachers. "Quest Conference on Violence in the Schools." Honolulu, October 1976.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A-1

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

1. SCHOOL________________________________

2. Enrollment_____________________

3. Organization: Grades K-12_________
   Grades 7-12_________
   Grades 9-12_________
   Grades 10-12________

4. Location: Rural________Suburban________City_______

5. Socioeconomic level of the community:
   Low___________Middle____________Upper___________

6. Is your school (a) experiencing rapid growth_____, (b) moderate growth_____, (c) stable_____, (d) declining enrollment_____, and/or (e) transient_____?

7. Ethnic Mix:
   Local____
   Service Dependents %____________

8. Number of security personnel:
   Burns __________CETA____________SCET_____________

9. What is the extent of your school-community relations? To what extent does the community cooperate with the school?

10. To what extent do parents cooperate with the school?
PTA______ PTSA______

11. In matters of discipline, to what extent do teachers cooperate? Are they doing their fair share of disciplining?

12. In handling discipline problems, do you receive the necessary support from your superiors?

13. How are rules and regulations disseminated and then enforced?

14. In what areas on campus do various kinds of behavior problems occur?

15. What time of day or year are discipline problems more likely to occur?

16. Frequency of occurrence

	Seldom	Occasionally	Frequently
Burglary	______	____________	__________
Vandalism	______	____________	__________
Violence (Fighting among students)	______	____________	__________
(Assaults on teachers - Amount this past year)	______	____________	__________
Arson (Number of fires this past year)	______	____________	__________
Disorderly conduct	______	____________	__________
Truancy	______	____________	__________
Smoking	______	____________	__________
Drug use	______	____________	__________

17. What special programs have been instituted to combat discipline problems?

18. Do you feel you have enough authority to deal with discipline problems at your school?

Student Rights:

Unions:

Other:

19. Are discipline problems at your school increasing_____,

decreasing_____, or remaining much the same_____?

20. In your opinion, why do some schools have more discipline problems than others?

21. What is the key to good school discipline?

APPENDIX A-2

1 September 1977

TO: TEACHERS IN HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE STATE OF HAWAII

FROM: JANET M. KALUS, TEACHER OF ENGLISH AT CAMPBELL HIGH SCHOOL

SUBJECT: RESEARCH REGARDING "THE ROLE OF THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN MAINTAINING SCHOOL DISCIPLINE"

As a student in the doctoral program at Walden University, I am conducting a research study in the area of "The Role of the High School Principal in Maintaining School Discipline."

The purpose of this communication is to request your cooperation in what is hoped to be a significant research study.

The major purpose of this study is to identify the extent of discipline problems in Hawaii's public high schools and to demonstrate the influence principals hold in the area of discipline.

This survey is being conducted specifically for a research project. The strictest confidentiality will be maintained and no individual school will be named in the final draft of the dissertation.

The attached questionnaire should take no more than twenty minutes of your time to answer. Please complete and enclose it in the envelope provided. Envelopes left with your school secretary will be picked up ____________. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Mahalo and Aloha,

(Mrs.) Janet M. Kalus

Please check or fill in the answer(s) that best describes your opinion. (There may be more than one answer in some cases.) Please feel free to make any additional comments to clarify your answer(s).

1. What is your attitude toward property damage and disturbances/acts of violence on the high school campus?

_____a. Unconcerned

_____b. Somewhat Concerned

_____c. Concerned

_____d. Deeply Concerned

2. Do you have personal knowledge of property damage and disturbances/acts of violence on your campus?

_____a. Unaware

_____b. Hearsay

_____c. Aware

_____d. Keenly Aware

3. What factors do you blame for property damage and disturbances/acts of violence on the high school campus?

_____a. Administration

_____b. Teachers

_____c. Students

_____d. Community

_____e. Facilities

_____f. Other________

4. In your opinion, why do students damage high school property and create disturbances/indulge in acts of violence on the high school campus?

_____a. Boredom/Restlessness

_____b. For Fun

_____c. Group/Gang Status

_____d. Recognition/Attention

_____e. Resentment Against School, Teachers, Administration.

5. What are the characteristics of students who are involved in vandalism and/or creating disturbances/ indulging in acts of violence?

	Please Comment
Home	______________________
Ability	______________________
Race/Ethnic Background	______________________
Socio-economic	______________________
Other	______________________

6. To what extent are you acquainted with the parents of your students?

_____a. No Contact

_____b. Hearsay

_____c. Student Source (themes, talk)

_____d. Casual

_____e. Personal Contact

7. What is your evaluation of the interest of the parents in your school?

_____a. Unaware

_____b. Resentful (Oppose the School)

_____c. Indifferent

_____d. Interested

_____e. Meddlesome (Interfering)

8. Why do high schools differ in damage rates and/or have a higher rate of disturbances/acts of violence?

_____a. Neighborhood

_____b. Facilities

_____c. Student Attitude

_____d. Staff Attitude

_____e. Administration

9. How should vandalism and disturbances/acts of violence on the high school campus be handled?

_____a. Ignore it

_____b. Teacher handle it

_____c. Principal handle it

_____d. Police handle it

_____e. Increase Security

10. What might be a solution to the problems of vandalism and violence on your campus?

_____a. Principal should tighten discipline

_____b. Curriculum Changes

_____c. Extra-curricular Activities

_____d. Increase Security

_____e. Expel Troublemakers

11. How might the teacher-teacher contacts in your school be described?

_____a. Minimal

_____b. Cooperative Professional

_____c. Lunch Room

_____d. Planned Social

_____e. Unplanned Social

12. How might the principal-teacher contacts in your school be described?

_____a. Formal

_____b. Principal Initiates

_____c. Principal or Teacher Initiates

_____d. Open Door

13. What is your evaluation of student attitude toward your school?

_____a. Enthusiastic

_____b. Respect

_____c. Casual

_____d. Indifferent

_____e. Resentment

14. What is your evaluation of teacher attitude toward your school?

_____a. Enthusiastic

_____b. Constructively Critical

_____c. Critical

_____d. Indifferent

_____e. Destructive Critical

15. In your opinion, what is the responsibility of teachers in matters of maintaining discipline?

_____a. Limited to Classroom

_____b. Anywhere in or around School Buildings

_____c. Principal's Responsibility

16. What type of administration exists at your school?

_____a. Rigid (Strict)

_____b. Strong

_____c. Democratic

_____d. Permissive

_____e. Indifferent

_____f. Weak

17. Does your school have a written policy for the handling of discipline problems?

_____a. Yes

_____b. No

18. In what way does your principal enforce school rules or policies?

_____a. Vigorously

_____b. Usually

_____c. Sometimes

_____d. Rarely

_____e. Not At All

19. What best describes your principal's actions in maintaining school discipline?

_____a. Firm

_____b. Fair

_____c. Consistent

_____d. Inconsistent

_____e. Unpredictable

20. What standards are set by your principal for your school?

_____a. High

_____b. Above average

_____c. Average

_____d. Below average

_____e. Low

21. Would you say that the principal is interested in the welfare of both teachers and students at your school?

_____a. Emphatically

_____b. Sufficiently

_____c. Somewhat

_____d. Little

_____e. Not At All

22. In what way does the principal support teachers in matters of discipline?

_____a. At All Times

_____b. Usually

_____c. Sometimes

_____d. Rarely

_____e. Not At All

23. How would you describe your school-community relations?

_____a. Extensive

_____b. Considerable

_____c. Passable

_____d. Little

_____e. None At All

24. Please write one short sentence (more if you desire) stating what you believe would help most in improving discipline in your school.

APPENDIX A-3

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JUNIOR STUDENTS

Check the one answer that most nearly describes how you feel.

1. Why do you attend school?

_____a. I go to school because it is compulsory.

_____b. I go because there is nothing else to do.

_____c. I go because my parents want me to finish high school.

_____d. I am preparing for a job.

_____e. I am preparing for college.

2. How do you feel your school compares with other schools?

_____a. My school is the best in every way.

_____b. My school is better than most schools.

_____c. My school is just as good as other schools.

_____d. My school is poorer than most.

_____e. My school is the poorest.

3. How do your parents feel about your school?

_____a. My parents think this is an excellent school.

_____b. They think it is a good school. I am getting a good education.

_____c. My parents don't say much about the school.

_____d. They think it is just fair, not too good.

_____e. They are very critical of my school. They don't like it.

4. Do you think your parents are interested in the school?

_____a. My parents are very interested and participate in school activities involving parents.

_____b. They sometimes participate in school activities involving parents.

_____c. They are indifferent. They don't care what happens.

_____d. They are really not interested. They come to school only if they are called by the principal.

_____e. They refuse to have anything to do with the school.

5. Do students have a part in planning school programs?

_____a. Students are allowed no say. The principal does it all.

_____b. Students are allowed some say -- when the principal asks for their judgment.

_____c. Students are consulted by the principal on many school matters.

_____d. The principal meets regularly with students to discuss plans.

_____e. Students plan projects with the approval of the principal.

6. What do you do about extra-curricular activities?

_____a. I am a leader and I take part in many activities.

_____b. I take part in some activities, but I am not a leader.

_____c. I attend some activities.

_____d. A few students run everything, and I don't belong.

_____e. There aren't any outside activities in my school.

7. How do students feel about your principal?

_____a. They are afraid of him. He is too strict.

_____b. They respect him. He is always fair and just.

_____c. Almost everyone thinks he is wonderful.

_____d. He is not strict enough. He is too easy-going.

_____e. The students know they can get away with anything.

8. How do you feel about the counselors in your school?

_____a. Counselors are very helpful in planning school schedules.

_____b. Counselors are very helpful when students have troubles or problems.

_____c. Counselors are only mildly interested in helping students.

_____d. Counselors act mainly as disciplinarians in our school. They punish students for misbehavior.

_____e. I don't know what the counselors do.

9. How strict are your teachers?

_____a. I think most of my teachers are much too strict.

_____b. I think most of my teachers are neither too strict nor too easy.

_____c. I think most of my teachers are much too lenient.

10. Does your school have a statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities?

_____a. Yes

_____b. No

_____c. I don't know.

11. Does your school have a written policy for handling discipline problems?

_____a. Yes

_____b. No

_____c. I don't know.

12. What do you do when you see a student damaging school property?

_____a. I report it to the principal or someone in the office.

_____b. I try to talk the student out of it.

_____c. I just tell my friends about it.

_____d. I join in on the fun.

_____e. I walk away and tell no one about it.

13. How would you describe the bathroom facilities at your school?

_____a. There are bullies in the bathrooms.

_____b. There is smoking in the bathrooms. I do not use the school's bathrooms.

_____c. I use the bathroom as a place to go to smoke.

_____d. Sometimes there are fights in the bathrooms. I am cautious when I go to the bathrooms.

_____e. I am not afraid to use the school's bathrooms. Our school has no problems with bathrooms.

14. To what extent are drug (pot and pills) a problem at your school?

_____a. Drugs are sold on our school campus and used by over half the student body.

_____b. Drugs are sold on our school campus and used by less than half of the student body.

_____c. Drugs are bought off-campus and used by over half the student body.

_____d. Less than half the student body uses drugs.

_____e. Very few students use drugs at our school.

15. How would you describe the student-teacher relationship at your school?

_____a. Students respect all the teachers.

_____b. Students respect most of the teachers.

_____c. Students "hassle" some of the teachers.

_____d. Students cause serious trouble in some classes.

_____e. Students cause serious trouble in most classes.

16. Why do students damage school property and/or create disturbances/indulge in acts of violence on the school campus?

_____a. They are bored/restless.

_____b. They are having fun.

_____c. They want status in their group/gang.

_____d. They want recognition/attention.

_____e. These students resent the school and what it offers. They do not feel that they are a part of the school, nor does the school belong to them.

17. What do you feel might be a solution to the problem of vandalism and violence on the high school campus?

_____a. The principal should get tough. Our school needs more discipline.

_____b. There should be more extra-curricular activities.

_____c. The curriculum should be changed.

_____d. Security should be increased.

_____e. All troublemakers should be expelled.

APPENDIX B-1

SIZE OF SCHOOL

SCHOOL	STUDENT ENROLLMENT
CR-1	1911
CR-2	2600
CR-3	2009
CR-4	2210
CR-5	2408
CR-6	2699
CR-7	1729
CR-8	1800
CR-9	1249
CR-10	2515
CR-11	2215
CR-12	1810
CR-13	1757
CR-14	2200
CR-15	1692
CR-16	1633
CR-17	1621
CR-18	1276
CR-19	1020

$r_s = .66$

APPENDIX B-2

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS
(N = 19)

	Number	Percent
Kindergarten through twelfth grade	1	5
Seventh through twelfth grade	2	11
Ninth through twelfth grade	13	68
Tenth through twelfth grade	3	16

APPENDIX B-3

SCHOOL - COMMUNITY RELATIONS
(N=17)

School	Extensive	Considerable	Passable	Little
CR-1		X		
CR-2		X		
CR-3	X			
CR-4	X			
CR-5				X
CR-6			X	
CR-7			X	
CR-8				X
CR-9			X	
CR-10				X
CR-11			X	
CR-14		X		
CR-15				X
CR-16	X			
CR-17		X		
CR-18			X	
CR-19	X			

APPENDIX B-4

PARENTAL COOPERATION WITH THE SCHOOL
(N=17)

School	PTA	PTSA	Extensive	Considerable	Passable	Little
CR-1					X	
CR-2					X	
CR-3		X			X	
CR-4					X	
CR-5						X
CR-6				X		
CR-7		X			X	
CR-8		X			X	
CR-9	X			X		
CR-10		X			X	
CR-11					X	
CR-14		X		X		
CR-15	X			X		
CR-16	X			X		
CR-17			X			
CR-18			X			
CR-19	X		X			

APPENDIX B-5

SPECIAL PROGRAMS TO COMBAT DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS

School	Detention	In-School Suspension	Alternative Schools	School-Within-a-School	Alienated Program or Special Motivation Classes	Tutoring Center
CR-1						
CR-2			X			
CR-3	X			X		X
CR-4			X			
CR-5		X		X		
CR-6	X				X	
CR-7	X					
CR-8					X	X
CR-9			X		X	
CR-10	X				X	
CR-11						
CR-14						
CR-15					X	
CR-16		X				
CR-17						
CR-18		X				
CR-19						

APPENDIX B-5 (CONTINUED)

School	Student Committees or Peer Group Counseling	Counseling or Out-Reach Counselors	Immigrant Programs	Multi-Cultural Club	Other
CR-1					Brodah and Sistah Club
CR-2			X		
CR-3		X			
CR-4		X			
CR-5		X			
CR-6	X				
CR-7					Discipline Panel
CR-8		X	X		
CR-9		X			
CR-10					
CR-11					
CR-14					
CR-15					
CR-16	X	X			
CR-17					
CR-18	X	X		X	
CR-19	X	X		X	

APPENDIX B-6

FACTORS RELATED TO THE DIFFERENCES IN THE EXTENT OF DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS
(N=17)

School	Leadership	Staff	Community	Socio-Economic	Student Values
CR-1			X		
CR-2		X	X		
CR-3	X	X			
CR-4	X				
CR-5				X	X
CR-6	X				
CR-7			X		
CR-8		X	X		
CR-9	X			X	
CR-10		X			
CR-11		X			
CR-14	X				
CR-15			X		
CR-16					X
CR-17	X	X		X	
CR-18					X
CR-19				X	

APPENDIX C-1

1. What is your attitude toward property damage and disturbances/acts of violence on the high school campus?

School	Somewhat Concerned		Concerned		Deeply Concerned		Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1			3	50.0	3	50.0	6
CR-2	3	30.0	1	10.0	6	60.0	10
CR-3			5	62.5	3	37.5	8
CR-4	1	12.5	2	25.0	5	62.5	8
CR-5	1	9.1	4	36.4	6	54.5	11
CR-6			2	20.0	8	80.0	10
CR-7			2	33.3	4	66.7	6
CR-8	No Teachers Participated						
CR-9			1	14.3	6	85.7	7
CR-10			5	27.8	13	72.2	18
CR-11			2	25.0	6	75.0	8
CR-12	No Teachers Participated						
CR-13	No Teachers Participated						
CR-14			4	57.1	3	42.9	7
CR-15			4	50.0	4	50.0	8
CR-16	1	20.0			4	80.0	5
CR-17			1	16.7	5	83.3	6
CR-18			4	66.7	2	33.3	6
CR-19	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50.0	6
TOTAL	7	5.4	42	32.3	81	62.3	130

APPENDIX C-2

2. Do you have personal knowledge of property damage and disturbances/acts of violence on your campus?

School	Unaware		Hearsay		Aware		Keenly Aware		Re-sponse	Teach-ers-
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1					3	50.0	3	50.0	6	6
CR-2			2	20.0	6	60.0	2	20.0	10	10
CR-3			2	25.0	6	75.0			8	8
CR-4			1	12.5	7	87.5			8	8
CR-5			1	9.1	7	63.6	3	27.3	11	11
CR-6					4	40.0	6	60.0	10	10
CR-7					3	50.0	3	50.0	6	6
CR-9	1	14.3			3	42.9	3	42.9	7	7
CR-10			5	26.3	8	42.1	6	31.6	19	18
CR-11			1	14.3	3	42.9	3	42.9	7	8
CR-14	2	25.0	1	12.5	5	62.5			8	7
CR-15			1	12.5	2	25.0	5	62.5	8	8
CR-16					3	60.0	2	40.0	5	5
CR-17	1	16.7			5	83.3			6	6
CR-18			3	42.9	3	42.9	1	14.3	7	6
CR-19	1	14.3	1	14.3	5	71.4			7	6
TOTAL	5	3.8	18	13.5	73	54.9	37	27.8	133	130

APPENDIX C-3

3. What factors do you blame for property damage and disturbances/acts of violence on your campus?

School	Administration		Teachers		Students		Community	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	3	15.8	1	5.3	6	31.6	6	31.6
CR-2	2	10.0	1	5.0	6	30.0	7	35.0
CR-3	4	15.4	4	15.4	8	30.8	5	19.2
CR-4	1	5.6	1	5.6	7	38.9	4	22.2
CR-5	7	20.0	6	17.1	7	20.0	8	22.9
CR-6	2	10.5	1	5.3	6	31.6	3	15.8
CR-7	1	7.7	1	7.7	5	38.5	2	15.4
CR-9	1	6.7	1	6.7	6	40.0	5	33.3
CR-10	5	8.9	6	10.7	17	30.4	10	17.9
CR-11	2	11.8	2	11.8	5	29.4	4	23.5
CR-14	1	6.7	1	6.7	5	33.3	3	20.0
CR-15	3	16.7	2	11.1	6	33.3	4	22.2
CR-16	4	26.7	3	20.0	2	13.3	3	20.0
CR-17					5	45.5	3	27.3
CR-18	3	16.7	2	11.1	5	27.8	3	16.7
CR-19					3	42.9		
TOTAL	39	12.1	32	9.9	99	30.7	70	21.7

APPENDIX C-3 (CONTINUED)

School	Facilities		Other		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	1	5.3	2	10.6	19	6
CR-2	2	10.0	2	10.0	20	10
CR-3	2	7.7	3	11.5	26	8
CR-4	2	11.1	3	16.7	18	8
CR-5	3	8.6	4	11.4	35	11
CR-6	5	26.3	2	10.5	19	10
CR-7	1	7.7	3	23.1	13	6
CR-9	2	13.3			15	7
CR-10	8	14.3	10	17.9	56	18
CR-11			4	23.5	17	8
CR-14	3	20.0	2	13.3	15	7
CR-15	2	11.1	1	5.6	18	8
CR-16	1	6.7	2	13.3	15	5
CR-17			3	27.3	11	6
CR-18	2	11.1	3	16.7	18	6
CR-19			4	57.1	7	6
TOTAL	34	10.6	48	14.9	322	130

APPENDIX C-4

4. In your opinion, why do students damage high school property and create disturbances/indulge in acts of violence on the high school campus?

School	Boredom		Fun		Status	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	5	22.7	5	22.7	4	18.2
CR-2	2	11.1	4	22.2	5	27.8
CR-3	6	20.0	6	20.0	6	20.0
CR-4	7	26.9	4	15.4	7	26.9
CR-5	6	25.0	2	8.3	7	29.2
CR-6	4	16.0	5	20.0	5	20.0
CR-7	4	20.0	3	15.0	4	20.0
CR-9	3	14.3	4	19.0	4	19.0
CR-10	6	11.5	8	15.4	13	25.0
CR-11	7	30.4	1	4.3	5	21.7
CR-14	7	31.8	3	13.6	5	22.7
CR-15	3	17.6	2	11.8	4	23.5
CR-16	1	8.3	1	8.3	4	33.3
CR-17	3	16.7	4	22.2	4	22.2
CR-18	5	25.0	4	20.0	3	15.0
CR-19	1	5.9	2	11.8	4	23.5
TOTAL	70	19.1	58	15.8	84	22.9

APPENDIX C-4 (CONTINUED)

School	Attention		Resentment		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	5	22.7	3	13.6	22	6
CR-2	4	22.2	3	16.7	18	10
CR-3	6	20.0	6	20.0	30	8
CR-4	4	15.4	4	15.4	26	8
CR-5	4	16.7	5	20.8	24	11
CR-6	5	20.0	6	24.0	25	10
CR-7	5	25.0	4	20.0	20	6
CR-9	4	19.0	6	28.6	21	7
CR-10	12	23.1	13	25.0	52	18
CR-11	3	13.0	7	30.4	23	8
CR-14	3	13.6	4	18.2	22	7
CR-15	3	17.6	5	29.4	17	8
CR-16	4	33.3	2	16.7	12	5
CR-17	4	22.2	3	16.7	18	6
CR-18	4	20.0	4	20.0	20	6
CR-19	5	29.4	5	29.4	17	6
TOTAL	75	20.4	80	21.8	367	130

APPENDIX C-5

5. What are the characteristics of students who are involved in vandalism and/or creating disturbances/ indulging in acts of violence?

School	Home		Ability		Race/Ethnic Background		Socio-Economic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	3	16.7	5	27.8	1	5.6	4	22.2
CR-2	5	38.5	3	23.1	1	7.7	2	15.4
CR-3	4	20.0	4	20.0	3	15.0	5	25.0
CR-4	3	27.3	3	27.3	1	9.1	3	27.3
CR-5	5	17.2	5	17.2	5	17.2	5	17.2
CR-6	4	16.0	5	20.0	3	12.0	4	16.0
CR-7	3	25.0	3	25.0	2	16.7	2	16.7
CR-9	7	28.0	4	16.0	4	16.0	3	12.0
CR-10	10	19.2	11	21.2	8	15.4	12	23.1
CR-11	4	15.4	5	19.2	5	19.2	6	23.1
CR-14	3	21.4	5	35.7			2	14.3
CR-15	4	18.2	4	18.2	4	18.2	5	22.7
CR-16	4	30.8	3	23.1	1	7.7	3	23.1
CR-17	4	14.8	6	22.2	5	18.5	6	22.2
CR-18	2	14.3	3	21.4	3	21.4	3	21.4
CR-19	4	19.0	5	23.8	2	9.5	4	19.0
TOTAL	69	20.2	74	21.6	48	14.0	69	20.2

APPENDIX C-5 (CONTINUED)

School	Sex, Age, Grade		Other		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	3	16.7	2	11.1	18	6
CR-2	1	7.7	1	7.7	13	10
CR-3	2	10.0	2	10.0	20	8
CR-4	1	9.1			11	8
CR-5	7	24.1	2	6.9	29	11
CR-6	6	24.0	3	12.0	25	10
CR-7	2	16.7			12	6
CR-9	7	28.0			25	7
CR-10	8	15.4	3	5.8	52	18
CR-11	5	19.2	1	3.8	26	8
CR-14	4	28.6			14	7
CR-15	4	18.2	1	4.5	22	8
CR-16	2	15.4			13	5
CR-17	6	22.2			27	6
CR-18	3	21.4			14	6
CR-19	5	23.8	1	4.8	21	6
TOTAL	66	19.3	16	4.7	342	130

APPENDIX C-6

6. To what extent are you acquainted with the parents of your students?

School	None		Hearsay		Student	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	2	22.2	1	11.1	2	22.2
CR-2	4	33.3	1	8.3	5	41.7
CR-3	1	6.7			4	26.7
CR-4	1	10.0			1	10.0
CR-5	3	13.0	1	4.3	6	26.1
CR-6	3	23.1			3	23.1
CR-7	1	9.1	2	18.2	2	18.2
CR-9	1	9.1	2	18.2	3	27.3
CR-10	3	8.3	4	11.1	13	36.1
CR-11	1	6.7			5	33.3
CR-14	1	7.7	1	7.7	4	30.8
CR-15	2	20.0			3	30.0
CR-16	1	10.0			1	10.0
CR-17					2	33.3
CR-18			1	12.5	3	37.5
CR-19					1	12.5
TOTAL	24	11.4	13	6.2	58	27.6

$r_s = .48$

APPENDIX C-6 (CONTINUED)

School	Casual		Personal		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	3	33.3	1	11.1	9	6
CR-2	1	8.3	1	8.3	12	10
CR-3	5	33.3	5	33.3	15	8
CR-4	6	60.0	2	20.0	10	8
CR-5	6	26.1	7	30.4	23	11
CR-6	7	53.8			13	10
CR-7	5	45.5	1	9.1	11	6
CR-9	3	27.3	2	18.2	11	7
CR-10	6	16.7	10	27.8	36	18
CR-11	5	33.3	4	26.7	15	8
CR-14	3	23.1	4	30.8	13	7
CR-15	2	20.0	3	30.0	10	8
CR-16	3	30.0	5	50.0	10	5
CR-17	1	16.7	3	50.0	6	6
CR-18	3	37.5	1	12.5	8	6
CR-19	4	50.0	3	37.5	8	6
TOTAL	63	30.0	52	24.8	210	130

APPENDIX C-7

7. What is your evaluation of the interest of the parents in your school?

School	Interested		Aware		Indifferent	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	2	22.2			5	55.6
CR-2	1	9.1	1	9.1	8	72.7
CR-3	5	25.0	4	20.0	7	35.0
CR-4	3	21.4	3	21.4	6	42.9
CR-5	5	20.8	4	16.7	9	37.5
CR-6	3	25.0	1	8.3	8	66.7
CR-7	3	33.3	1	11.1	4	44.4
CR-9	2	20.0	3	30.0	3	30.0
CR-10	12	38.7	8	25.8	10	32.3
CR-11	5	45.5	3	27.3	3	27.3
CR-14	3	42.9	1	14.3	3	42.9
CR-15	4	33.3	1	8.3	5	41.7
CR-16	5	45.5	1	9.1	3	27.3
CR-17	5	71.4			2	28.6
CR-18	3	37.5			4	50.0
CR-19	6	66.7	1	11.1	2	22.2
TOTAL	67	32.7	32	15.6	82	40.0

$r_s = .79$

APPENDIX C-7 (CONTINUED)

School	Meddlesome		Resentful		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	1	11.1	1	11.1	9	6
CR-2	1	9.1			11	10
CR-3	1	5.0	3	15.0	20	8
CR-4	1	7.1	1	7.1	14	8
CR-5	3	12.5	3	12.5	24	11
CR-6					12	10
CR-7			1	11.1	9	6
CR-9	1	10.0	1	10.0	10	7
CR-10			1	3.2	31	18
CR-11					11	8
CR-14					7	7
CR-15	1	8.3	1	8.3	12	8
CR-16			2	18.2	11	5
CR-17					7	6
CR-18	1	12.5			8	6
CR-19					9	6
TOTAL	10	4.9	14	6.8	205	130

APPENDIX C-8

8. Why do high schools differ in damage rates and/or have a higher rate of disturbances/acts of violence?

School	Neighborhood		Facilities		Student Attitude	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	6	42.9	2	14.3	5	35.7
CR-2	7	35.0	3	15.0	6	30.0
CR-3	4	22.2	1	5.6	6	33.3
CR-4	6	33.3	1	5.6	5	27.8
CR-5	8	22.2	4	11.1	10	27.8
CR-6	6	23.1	5	19.2	8	30.8
CR-7	1	11.1			5	55.6
CR-9	6	33.3	3	16.7	7	38.9
CR-10	5	13.5	5	13.5	14	37.8
CR-11	5	29.4	2	11.8	6	35.3
CR-14	5	26.3	2	10.5	6	31.6
CR-15	5	26.3	2	10.5	7	36.8
CR-16	4	22.2	1	5.6	4	22.2
CR-17	3	25.0	1	8.3	6	50.0
CR-18	3	18.8	1	6.3	6	37.5
CR-19	6	26.1	3	13.0	5	21.7
TOTAL	80	25.0	36	11.3	106	33.1

APPENDIX C-8 (CONTINUED)

School	Staff Attitude		Administration		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1			1	7.1	14	6
CR-2	2	10.0	2	10.0	20	10
CR-3	3	16.7	4	22.2	18	8
CR-4	3	16.7	3	16.7	18	8
CR-5	7	19.4	7	19.4	36	11
CR-6	3	11.5	4	15.4	26	10
CR-7	2	22.2	1	11.1	9	6
CR-9	1	5.6	1	5.6	18	7
CR-10	7	18.9	6	16.2	37	18
CR-11	2	11.8	2	11.8	17	8
CR-14	3	15.8	3	15.8	19	7
CR-15	2	10.5	3	15.8	19	8
CR-16	5	27.8	4	22.2	18	5
CR-17	1	8.3	1	8.3	12	6
CR-18	3	18.8	3	18.8	16	6
CR-19	4	17.4	5	21.7	23	6
TOTAL	48	15.0	50	15.6	320	130

APPENDIX C-9

9. How should vandalism and disturbances/acts of violence on the high school campus be handled?

School	Teacher Handle		Principal Handle		Police		Security		Re-sponses	Teach-ers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	4	22.2	4	22.2	4	22.2	6	33.3	18	6
CR-2	4	15.4	7	26.9	7	26.9	8	30.8	26	10
CR-3	5	23.8	6	28.6	6	28.6	4	19.0	21	8
CR-4	4	19.0	5	23.8	7	33.3	5	23.8	21	8
CR-5	8	21.6	9	24.3	10	27.0	10	27.0	37	11
CR-6	3	16.7	4	22.2	6	33.3	5	27.8	18	10
CR-7	5	31.3	4	25.0	4	25.0	3	18.8	16	6
CR-9	4	19.0	4	19.0	6	28.6	7	33.3	21	7
CR-10	7	15.2	11	23.9	15	32.6	13	28.3	46	18
CR-11	7	26.9	7	26.9	5	19.2	7	26.9	26	8
CR-14	4	21.1	5	26.3	5	26.3	5	26.3	19	7
CR-15	3	16.7	4	22.2	7	38.9	4	22.2	18	8
CR-16	5	29.4	5	29.4	3	17.6	4	23.5	17	5
CR-17	1	8.3	3	25.0	5	41.7	3	25.0	12	6
CR-18	3	25.0	4	33.3	4	33.3	1	8.3	12	6
CR-19	5	25.0	5	25.0	5	25.0	5	25.0	20	6
TOTAL	72	20.7	87	25.0	99	28.4	90	25.9	348	130

APPENDIX C-10

10. What might be a solution to the problems of vandalism and violence on your campus?

School	More Discipline		Curriculum Changes		Activities	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	4	28.6	2	14.3	2	14.3
CR-2	5	29.4	1	5.9	1	5.9
CR-3	4	19.0	5	23.8	3	14.3
CR-4	3	17.6	1	5.9	3	17.6
CR-5	11	34.4	3	9.4	3	9.4
CR-6	7	19.4	6	16.7	6	16.7
CR-7	4	44.4	2	22.2		
CR-9	1	5.6	2	11.1	3	16.7
CR-10	8	19.5	5	12.2	6	14.6
CR-11	5	19.2	4	15.4	5	19.2
CR-14	4	22.2	3	16.7	3	16.7
CR-15	2	15.4	3	23.1	1	7.7
CR-16	4	23.5	3	17.6	3	17.6
CR-17	2	22.2	1	11.1		
CR-18	2	22.2	1	11.1	1	11.1
CR-19	3	23.1	1	7.7	3	23.1
TOTAL	69	22.3	43	13.9	43	13.9

APPENDIX C-10 (CONTINUED)

School	Security		Expulsion		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	3	21.4	3	21.4	14	6
CR-2	4	23.5	6	35.3	17	10
CR-3	4	19.0	5	23.8	21	8
CR-4	5	29.4	5	29.4	17	8
CR-5	7	21.9	8	25.0	32	11
CR-6	8	22.2	9	25.0	36	10
CR-7	1	11.1	2	22.2	9	6
CR-9	6	33.3	6	33.3	18	7
CR-10	9	22.0	13	31.7	41	18
CR-11	6	23.1	6	23.1	26	8
CR-14	3	16.7	5	27.8	18	7
CR-15	1	7.7	6	46.2	13	8
CR-16	3	17.6	4	23.5	17	5
CR-17	3	33.3	3	33.3	9	6
CR-18	3	33.3	2	22.2	9	6
CR-19	3	23.1	3	23.1	13	6
TOTAL	69	22.3	86	27.7	310	130

APPENDIX C-11

11. How might the teacher-teacher contacts in your school be described?

School	Profes-sional		Planned Social		Unplanned Social	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	3	33.3				
CR-2	7	35.0	2	10.0	1	5.0
CR-3	5	27.8	4	22.2	2	11.1
CR-4	5	41.7	1	8.3		
CR-5	4	25.0	1	6.3	1	6.3
CR-6	5	29.4	1	5.9	2	11.8
CR-7	5	45.5	2	18.2		
CR-9	5	35.7	3	21.4		
CR-10	10	26.3	14	36.8	4	10.5
CR-11	5	31.3	5	31.3	2	12.5
CR-14	5	35.7	3	21.4	1	7.1
CR-15	4	30.8	3	23.1		
CR-16	3	37.5	2	25.0	1	12.5
CR-17	5	50.0	3	30.0	1	10.0
CR-18	6	50.0	3	25.0	1	8.3
CR-19	6	33.3	4	22.2	4	22.2
TOTAL	83	33.7	51	20.7	20	8.1

$r_s = .84$

APPENDIX C-11 (CONTINUED)

School	Lunch-room		Minimal		Re-sponses	Teach-ers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	2	22.2	4	44.4	9	6
CR-2	4	20.0	6	30.0	20	10
CR-3	5	27.8	2	11.1	18	8
CR-4	4	33.3	2	16.7	12	8
CR-5	4	25.0	6	37.5	16	11
CR-6	6	35.3	3	17.6	17	10
CR-7	2	18.2	2	18.2	11	6
CR-9	3	21.4	3	21.4	14	7
CR-10	6	15.8	4	10.5	38	18
CR-11	3	18.8	1	6.3	16	8
CR-14	3	21.4	2	14.3	14	7
CR-15	5	38.5	1	7.7	13	8
CR-16	1	12.5	1	12.5	8	5
CR-17	1	10.0			10	6
CR-18	2	16.7			12	6
CR-19	3	16.7	1	5.6	18	6
TOTAL	54	22.0	38	15.4	246	130

APPENDIX C-12

12. How might the principal-teacher contacts in your school be described?

School	Formal		Principal Initiates		Either Initiates		Open Door		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	1	12.5	1	12.5	2	25.0	4	50.0	8	6
CR-2	1	6.7	2	13.3	4	26.7	8	53.3	15	10
CR-3	2	16.7	1	8.3	6	50.0	3	25.0	12	8
CR-4	1	10.0			1	10.0	8	80.0	10	8
CR-5			1	7.7	6	46.2	6	46.2	13	11
CR-6	3	21.4	2	14.3	4	28.6	5	35.7	14	10
CR-7			1	11.1	2	22.2	6	66.7	9	6
CR-9			1	10.0	2	20.0	7	70.0	10	7
CR-10			1	3.7	9	33.3	17	63.0	27	18
CR-11	1	9.1	2	18.2	2	18.2	6	54.5	11	8
CR-14					3	33.3	6	66.7	9	7
CR-15	1	9.1	1	9.1	4	36.4	5	45.5	11	8
CR-16	2	22.2	2	22.2	3	33.3	2	22.2	9	5
CR-17			1	14.3	1	14.3	5	71.4	7	6
CR-18			1	11.1	2	22.2	6	66.7	9	6
CR-19	1	7.7	3	23.1	5	38.5	4	30.8	13	6
TOTAL	13	7.0	20	10.7	56	29.9	98	52.4	187	130

$r_s = .08$

APPENDIX C-13

13. What is your evaluation of student attitude toward your school?

School	Enthusiastic		Respect		Casual	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	2	11.8	3	17.6	4	23.5
CR-2	2	15.4	3	23.1	5	38.5
CR-3	3	16.7	3	16.7	5	27.8
CR-4	1	12.5			6	75.0
CR-5	1	5.0	2	10.0	9	45.0
CR-6	4	19.0	3	14.3	6	28.6
CR-7	2	28.6			3	42.9
CR-9	3	18.8	3	18.8	4	25.0
CR-10	7	18.4	5	13.2	14	36.8
CR-11	2	14.3	4	28.6	2	14.3
CR-14	3	37.5	3	37.5	2	25.0
CR-15	2	14.3	5	35.7	3	21.4
CR-16	2	20.0	3	30.0	3	30.0
CR-17	2	22.2	4	44.4	2	22.2
CR-18			1	9.1	6	54.5
CR-19	4	30.8	4	30.8	3	23.1
TOTAL	40	16.9	46	19.4	77	32.5

$r_s = .44$

APPENDIX C-13 (CONTINUED)

School	Indifferent		Resentment		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	5	29.4	3	17.6	17	6
CR-2	3	23.1			13	10
CR-3	4	22.2	3	16.7	18	8
CR-4	1	12.5			8	8
CR-5	5	25.0	3	15.0	20	11
CR-6	5	23.8	3	14.3	21	10
CR-7	1	14.3	1	14.3	7	6
CR-9	5	31.3	1	6.3	16	7
CR-10	7	18.4	5	13.2	38	18
CR-11	4	28.6	2	14.3	14	8
CR-14					8	7
CR-15	2	14.3	2	14.3	14	8
CR-16	2	20.0			10	5
CR-17	1	11.1			9	6
CR-18	3	27.3	1	9.1	11	6
CR-19	1	7.7	1	7.7	13	6
TOTAL	49	20.7	25	10.5	237	130

APPENDIX C-14

14. What is your evaluation of teacher attitude toward your school?

School	Enthused		Constr. Critical		Critical	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	2	16.7	5	41.7	2	16.7
CR-2	2	18.2	3	27.3	2	18.2
CR-3	4	22.2	5	27.8	4	22.2
CR-4	3	25.0	5	41.7	2	16.7
CR-5			6	40.0	3	20.0
CR-6	2	14.3	5	35.7	3	21.4
CR-7	4	44.4	3	33.3	1	11.1
CR-9	1	8.3	3	25.0	4	33.3
CR-10	7	22.6	9	29.0	9	29.0
CR-11	3	25.0	7	58.3	1	8.3
CR-14	3	33.3	5	55.6	1	11.1
CR-15	1	10.0	4	40.0	3	30.0
CR-16	4	44.4	2	22.2	1	11.1
CR-17	4	44.4	4	44.4		
CR-18	2	28.6	4	57.1	1	14.3
CR-19	4	44.4	4	44.4		
TOTAL	46	23.1	74	37.2	37	18.6

$r_s = .69$

APPENDIX C-14 (CONTINUED)

School	Indifferent		Destruct. Critical		Re-sponses	Teach-ers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	3	25.0			12	6
CR-2	4	36.4			11	10
CR-3	3	16.7	2	11.1	18	8
CR-4	2	16.7			12	8
CR-5	6	40.0			15	11
CR-6	4	28.6			14	10
CR-7	1	11.1			9	6
CR-9	3	25.0	1	8.3	12	7
CR-10	6	19.4			31	18
CR-11	1	8.3			12	8
CR-14					9	7
CR-15	2	20.0			10	8
CR-16	2	22.2			9	5
CR-17	1	11.1			9	6
CR-18					7	6
CR-19	1	11.1			9	6
TOTAL	39	19.6	3	1.5	199	130

APPENDIX C-15

15. In your opinion, what is the responsibility of teachers in matters of maintaining discipline?

School	Limited		Anywhere		Principal		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	3	37.5	3	37.5	2	25.0	8	6
CR-2	3	25.0	8	66.7	1	8.3	12	10
CR-3	4	50.0	4	50.0			8	8
CR-4			8	100.0			8	8
CR-5			11	91.7	1	8.3	12	11
CR-6	5	50.0	3	30.0	2	20.0	10	10
CR-7			6	100.0			6	6
CR-9	3	27.3	7	63.6	1	9.1	11	7
CR-10	4	17.4	16	69.6	3	13.0	23	18
CR-11			8	100.0			8	8
CR-14	1	12.5	7	87.5			8	7
CR-15	2	18.2	6	54.5	3	27.3	11	8
CR-16	3	42.9	3	42.9	1	14.3	7	5
CR-17			6	100.0			6	6
CR-18	3	42.9	2	28.6	2	28.6	7	6
CR-19	1	14.3	6	85.7			7	6
TOTAL	32	21.1	104	68.4	16	10.5	152	130

APPENDIX C-16

16. What type of administration exists at your school?

School	Rigid		Strong		Democratic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1					2	25.0
CR-2			4	30.8	6	46.2
CR-3	1	9.1	8	72.7	2	18.2
CR-4			3	30.0	7	70.0
CR-5					4	20.0
CR-6			1	11.1	4	44.4
CR-7			4	44.4	5	55.6
CR-9			5	50.0	4	40.0
CR-10			6	27.3	12	54.5
CR-11	1	9.1	7	63.6	3	27.3
CR-14					5	100.0
CR-15					5	62.5
CR-16			3	37.5	5	62.5
CR-17			6	75.0	2	25.0
CR-18			3	42.9	3	42.9
CR-19	3	27.3	6	54.5	2	18.2
TOTAL	5	2.9	56	32.9	71	41.8

$r_s = .41$

APPENDIX C-16 (CONTINUED)

School	Permissive		Indifferent		Weak		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	3	37.5	1	12.5	2	25.0	8	6
CR-2	1	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7	13	10
CR-3							11	8
CR-4							10	8
CR-5	6	30.0	4	20.0	6	30.0	20	11
CR-6	1	11.1	1	11.1	2	22.2	9	10
CR-7							9	6
CR-9	1	10.0					10	7
CR-10	2	9.1	1	4.5	1	4.5	22	18
CR-11							11	8
CR-14							5	7
CR-15	2	25.0			1	12.5	8	8
CR-16							8	5
CR-17	1	14.3					8	6
CR-18							7	6
CR-19							11	6
TOTAL	17	10.0	8	4.7	13	7.6	170	130

APPENDIX C-17

17. Does your school have a written policy for the handling of discipline problems?

School	Yes		No		Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	6	100.0			6
CR-2	10	100.0			10
CR-3	8	100.0			8
CR-4	8	100.0			8
CR-5	10	90.9	1	9.0	11
CR-6	10	100.0			10
CR-7	6	100.0			6
CR-9	7	100.0			7
CR-10	17	94.4	1	5.6	18
CR-11	7	100.0			7
CR-14	7	100.0			7
CR-15	6	75.0	2	25.0	8
CR-16	5	100.0			5
CR-17	6	100.0			6
CR-18	4	66.7	2	33.3	6
CR-19	6	100.0			6
TOTAL	123	95.3	6	4.7	129

APPENDIX C-18

18. In what way does your principal enforce school rules or policies?

School	Vigorously		Usually		Sometimes	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	1	12.5	3	37.5	4	50.0
CR-2	3	30.0	3	30.0	2	20.0
CR-3	4	57.1	3	42.9		
CR-4	4	50.0	4	50.0		
CR-5			2	18.2	4	36.4
CR-6	1	9.1	6	54.5	4	36.4
CR-7	6	100.0				
CR-9	4	50.0	4	50.0		
CR-10	9	56.3	6	37.5	1	6.3
CR-11	5	62.5	3	37.5		
CR-14			4	100.0		
CR-15			3	50.0	2	33.3
CR-16	3	60.0			2	40.0
CR-17	6	100.0				
CR-18	2	33.3	4	66.7		
CR-19	6	100.0				
TOTAL	54	42.9	45	35.7	19	15.1

$r_s = .45$

APPENDIX C-18 (CONTINUED)

School	Rarely		Not at All		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1					8	6
CR-2	1	10.0	1	10.0	10	10
CR-3					7	8
CR-4					8	8
CR-5	4	36.4	1	9.0	11	11
CR-6					11	10
CR-7					6	6
CR-9					8	7
CR-10					16	18
CR-11					8	8
CR-14					4	7
CR-15	1	16.7			6	8
CR-16					5	5
CR-17					6	6
CR-18					6	6
CR-19					6	6
TOTAL	6	4.8	2	1.6	126	130

APPENDIX C-19

19. What best describes your principal's actions in maintaining school discipline?

School	Firm		Consistant		Fair	
CR-1			3	37.5	2	25.0
CR-2	1	10.0	2	20.0	6	60.0
CR-3	3	30.0	3	30.0	4	40.0
CR-4	3	25.0	3	25.0	6	50.0
CR-5			1	7.7	2	15.4
CR-6	1	11.1			4	44.4
CR-7	4	30.8	5	38.5	4	30.8
CR-9	4	33.3	3	25.0	5	41.7
CR-10	7	24.1	5	17.2	14	48.3
CR-11	5	50.0	3	30.0	2	20.0
CR-14			2	28.6	5	71.4
CR-15	1	10.0			5	50.0
CR-16	1	14.3	4	57.1	2	28.6
CR-17	3	30.0	3	30.0	4	40.0
CR-18	2	28.6	3	42.9	1	14.3
CR-19	6	60.0	2	20.0	2	20.0
TOTAL	41	23.2	42	23.7	68	38.4

$r_s = .43$

APPENDIX C-19 (CONTINUED)

School	Inconsistent		Unpredictable		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	1	12.5	2	25.0	8	6
CR-2			1	10.0	10	10
CR-3					10	8
CR-4					12	8
CR-5	7	53.8	3	23.1	13	11
CR-6	1	11.1	3	33.3	9	10
CR-7					13	6
CR-9					12	7
CR-10	2	6.9	1	3.4	29	18
CR-11					10	8
CR-14					7	7
CR-15	2	20.0	2	20.0	10	8
CR-16					7	5
CR-17					10	6
CR-18	1	14.3			7	6
CR-19					10	6
TOTAL	14	7.9	12	6.8	177	130

APPENDIX C-20

20. What standards are set by your principal for your school?

School	High		Above Average		Average	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	1	14.3	1	14.3	4	57.1
CR-2	4	40.0	4	40.0	1	10.0
CR-3	5	62.5	2	25.0	1	12.5
CR-4	3	37.5	5	62.5		
CR-5	1	9.0	2	18.2	3	27.3
CR-6	1	12.5	2	25.0	5	62.5
CR-7	5	83.3	1	16.7		
CR-9	3	42.9	1	14.3	3	42.9
CR-10	10	55.6	6	33.3	2	11.1
CR-11	2	25.0	4	50.0	2	25.0
CR-14	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3
CR-15	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50.0
CR-16	3	60.0	2	40.0		
CR-17	5	83.3	1	16.7		
CR-18	1	16.7	5	83.3		
CR-19	5	83.3	1	16.7		
TOTAL	52	41.3	41	32.5	26	20.6

$r_s = .45$

APPENDIX C-20 (CONTINUED)

School	Below Average		Low		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	1	14.3			7	6
CR-2	1	10.0			10	10
CR-3					8	8
CR-4					8	8
CR-5	4	36.4	1	9.0	11	11
CR-6					8	10
CR-7					6	6
CR-9					7	7
CR-10					18	18
CR-11					8	8
CR-14					6	7
CR-15					6	8
CR-16					5	5
CR-17					6	6
CR-18					6	6
CR-19					6	6
TOTAL	6	4.8	1	.8	126	130

APPENDIX C-21

21. Would you say that the principal is interested in the welfare of both teachers and students at your school?

School	Emphatically		Sufficiently		Somewhat	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	1	14.3	3	42.9	3	42.9
CR-2	4	40.0	5	50.0	1	10.0
CR-3	6	75.0	2	25.0		
CR-4	7	87.5	1	12.5		
CR-5	1	7.7	5	38.5	3	23.1
CR-6	2	22.2	5	55.6	2	22.2
CR-7	6	100.0				
CR-9	6	85.7	1	14.3		
CR-10	11	61.1	7	38.9		
CR-11	2	25.0	5	62.5	1	12.5
CR-14	4	57.1	2	28.6	1	14.3
CR-15	4	50.0	2	25.0	2	25.0
CR-16	2	40.0	3	60.0		
CR-17	4	66.7	2	33.3		
CR-18	5	83.3	1	16.7		
CR-19	6	100.0				
TOTAL	71	53.8	44	33.3	13	9.8

$r_s = .40$

APPENDIX C-21 (CONTINUED)

School	Little		At All		Re-sponses	Teach-ers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1					7	6
CR-2					10	10
CR-3					8	8
CR-4					8	8
CR-5	3	23.1	1	7.7	13	11
CR-6					9	10
CR-7					6	6
CR-9					7	7
CR-10					18	18
CR-11					8	8
CR-14					7	7
CR-15					8	8
CR-16					5	5
CR-17					6	6
CR-18					6	6
CR-19					6	6
TOTAL	3	2.3	1	.8	132	130

APPENDIX C-22

22. In what way does the principal support teachers in matters of discipline?

School	All Times		Usually		Sometimes	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	1	14.3	2	28.6	4	57.1
CR-2	2	22.2	5	55.6	1	11.1
CR-3	1	20.0	4	80.0		
CR-4	7	87.5	1	12.5		
CR-5			4	33.3	4	33.3
CR-6	1	12.5	6	75.0	1	12.5
CR-7	6	100.0				
CR-9	5	62.5	3	37.5		
CR-10	10	62.5	6	37.5		
CR-11	3	37.5	5	62.5		
CR-14	2	33.3	4	66.7		
CR-15	3	50.0	1	16.7		
CR-16	1	25.0	3	75.0		
CR-17	5	83.3	1	16.7		
CR-18	1	16.7	5	83.3		
CR-19	6	100.0				
TOTAL	54	44.6	50	41.3	10	8.3

$r_s = .39$

APPENDIX C-22 (CONTINUED)

School	Rarely		Not at All		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1					7	6
CR-2	1	11.1			9	10
CR-3					5	8
CR-4					8	8
CR-5	2	16.7	2	16.7	12	11
CR-6					8	10
CR-7					6	6
CR-9					8	7
CR-10					16	18
CR-11					8	8
CR-14					6	7
CR-15	2	33.3			6	8
CR-16					4	5
CR-17					6	6
CR-18					6	6
CR-19					6	6
TOTAL	5	4.1	2	1.7	121	130

APPENDIX C-23

23. How would you describe your school-community relations?

School	Extensive		Considerable		Passable	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1			1	16.7	2	33.3
CR-2	1	11.1	1	11.1	5	55.6
CR-3	1	12.5	5	62.5		
CR-4	1	12.5	4	50.0	2	25.0
CR-5					7	58.3
CR-6			1	10.0	4	40.0
CR-7			4	66.7	2	33.3
CR-9					5	55.6
CR-10	2	11.1	9	50.0	5	27.8
CR-11			2	25.0	4	50.0
CR-14	1	14.3	3	42.9	3	42.9
CR-15			2	25.0	4	50.0
CR-16	2	33.3	1	16.7	2	33.3
CR-17	2	33.3	3	50.0	1	16.7
CR-18			3	50.0	2	33.3
CR-19	3	50.0	3	50.0		
TOTAL	13	9.8	42	31.6	48	36.1

$r_s = .52$

APPENDIX C-23 (CONTINUED)

School	Little		None		Responses	Teachers
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
CR-1	2	33.3	1	16.7	6	6
CR-2	2	22.2			9	10
CR-3	1	12.5	1	12.5	8	8
CR-4	1	12.5			8	8
CR-5	3	25.0	2	16.7	12	11
CR-6	4	40.0	1	10.0	10	10
CR-7					6	6
CR-9	3	33.3	1	11.1	9	7
CR-10	2	11.1			18	18
CR-11	2	25.0			8	8
CR-14					7	7
CR-15	2	25.0			8	8
CR-16	1	16.7			6	5
CR-17					6	6
CR-18	1	16.7			6	6
CR-19					6	6
TOTAL	24	18.0	6	4.5	133	130

APPENDIX C-24

24. What do you believe would help most in improving discipline in your school?

	Help/Cooperation/ Support from the Administration		Rules with Firm Enforcement		More/Tighter Security		School-Community Relations	
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	1	25.0			1	25.0		
CR-2	2	18.2	2	18.2	1	9.1		
CR-3	1	14.3	2	28.6			2	28.6
CR-4								
CR-5	1	11.1	2	22.2	1	11.1		
CR-6			2	22.2	2	22.2		
CR-7	1	14.3	1	14.3				
CR-9	1	7.1	1	7.1			3	21.4
CR-10	1	4.5	3	13.6	2	9.1	2	9.1
CR-11			1	11.1			2	22.2
CR-14			3	42.9	1	14.3		
CR-15	1	12.5	1	12.5			2	25.0
CR-16	1	16.7	2	33.3				
CR-17	1	20.0						
CR-18					1	20.0		
CR-19					1	14.3		
TOTAL	11	8.1	20	14.7	10	7.4	11	8.1

APPENDIX C-24 (CONTINUED)

School	Parental Responsibility No.	Parental Responsibility %	All Work Together School-Family Community No.	All Work Together School-Family Community %	Special Classes Alternative Schools No.	Special Classes Alternative Schools %	Build Pride in School No.	Build Pride in School %
CR-1	1	25.0						
CR-2	1	9.1					1	9.1
CR-3					1	14.3		
CR-4	1	16.7	1	16.7			1	16.7
CR-5	1	11.1	2	22.2				
CR-6			2	22.2				
CR-7	1	14.3	1	14.3	2	28.6		
CR-9	4	28.6	2	14.3	2	14.3	1	7.1
CR-10	2	9.1	1	4.5	1	4.5	1	4.5
CR-11	1	11.1	2	22.2	1	11.1	1	11.1
CR-14	1	14.3						
CR-15	1	12.5						
CR-16			1	16.7	1	16.7		
CR-17	2	40.0						
CR-18	2	40.0	1	20.0			1	20.0
CR-19	3	42.9	1	14.3				
TOTAL	21	15.4	14	10.3	8	5.9	6	4.4

APPENDIX C-24 (CONTINUED)

School	Teachers Upholding Rules and Regulations Quality Teaching		Student Attitudinal Changes		Other		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1					1	25.0	4
CR-2					4	36.4	11
CR-3			1	14.3			7
CR-4	2	33.3			1	16.7	6
CR-5	1	11.1			1	11.1	9
CR-6					3	33.3	9
CR-7	1	14.3					7
CR-9							14
CR-10	1	4.5	3	13.6	5	22.7	22
CR-11					1	11.1	9
CR-14			1	14.3	1	14.3	7
CR-15	2	25.0			1	12.5	8
CR-16	1	16.7					6
CR-17	1	20.0			1	20.0	5
CR-18							5
CR-19			1	14.3	1	14.3	7
TOTAL	9	6.6	6	4.4	20	14.7	136

APPENDIX D-1

1. Why do you attend school?

School	Compulsory		Idle		Parents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	6	35.3			2	11.8
CR-2			2	4.4	3	6.7
CR-3	2	8.7	2	8.7	8	34.8
CR-4	2	6.9			3	10.3
CR-5					3	12.0
CR-6	6	15.0			10	25.0
CR-7	5	26.3			3	15.8
CR-8	1	14.3			1	14.3
CR-9	3	20.0			4	26.7
CR-10	4	14.8	1	3.7	1	3.7
CR-11	1	4.2	1	4.2	5	20.8
CR-12	3	15.8			1	5.3
CR-13	6	40.0			1	6.7
CR-14	5	20.0			11	44.0
CR-15	1	2.9	1	2.9	1	2.9
CR-16	2	16.7	2	16.7	4	33.3
CR-17					4	20.0
CR-18	3	15.0			2	10.0
CR-19	1	6.3			1	6.3
TOTAL	51	11.8	9	2.1	68	15.7

APPENDIX D-1 (CONTINUED)

School	Job		College		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	3	17.6	6	35.3	17
CR-2	8	17.8	32	71.1	45
CR-3	5	21.7	6	26.1	23
CR-4	5	17.2	19	65.6	29
CR-5	4	16.0	18	72.0	25
CR-6	9	22.5	15	37.5	40
CR-7	1	5.3	10	52.6	19
CR-8			5	71.4	7
CR-9	3	20.0	5	33.3	15
CR-10	5	18.5	16	59.3	27
CR-11	4	16.7	13	54.2	24
CR-12	2	10.5	13	68.4	19
CR-13	4	26.7	4	26.7	15
CR-14	1	4.0	8	32.0	25
CR-15	7	20.6	24	70.6	34
CR-16	2	16.7	2	16.7	12
CR-17	5	25.0	11	55.0	20
CR-18	2	10.0	13	65.0	20
CR-19	5	31.3	9	56.3	16
TOTAL	75	17.4	229	53.0	432

APPENDIX D-2

2. How do you feel your school compares with other schools?

School	Best		Better		Good	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	1	5.9	2	11.8	11	64.7
CR-2	6	13.3	5	11.1	30	66.7
CR-3	4	17.4	7	30.4	11	47.8
CR-4	6	20.7	9	31.0	11	37.9
CR-5			3	12.0	15	60.0
CR-6	3	7.5	10	25.0	23	57.5
CR-7			4	21.1	8	42.1
CR-8			2	28.6	5	71.4
CR-9	3	20.0	3	20.0	3	20.0
CR-10	1	3.7	9	33.3	15	55.6
CR-11	1	4.2	5	20.8	12	50.0
CR-12	2	10.5	8	42.1	8	42.1
CR-13			5	35.7	9	64.3
CR-14	4	16.0	12	48.0	9	36.0
CR-15			19	57.6	11	33.3
CR-16	1	8.3	1	8.3	10	83.3
CR-17	3	15.0	10	50.0	5	25.0
CR-18	1	5.0	10	50.0	7	35.0
CR-19	2	12.5	11	68.8	3	18.8
TOTAL	38	8.8	135	31.4	206	47.9

$r_s = .44$

APPENDIX D-2 (CONTINUED)

School	Poorer		Poorest		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	2	11.8	1	5.9	17
CR-2	4	8.9			45
CR-3	1	4.3			23
CR-4	3	10.3			29
CR-5	7	28.0			25
CR-6	4	10.0			40
CR-7	7	36.8			19
CR-8					7
CR-9	2	13.3	4	26.7	15
CR-10	1	3.7	1	3.7	27
CR-11	4	16.7	2	8.3	24
CR-12	1	5.3			19
CR-13					14
CR-14					25
CR-15	3	9.1			33
CR-16					12
CR-17	2	10.0			20
CR-18	2	10.0			20
CR-19					16
TOTAL	43	10.0	8	1.9	430

APPENDIX D-3

3. How do your parents feel about your school?

School	Enthused		Favorable		Noncommittal	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	1	5.9	6	35.3	8	47.1
CR-2	4	8.9	18	40.0	22	48.9
CR-3	2	8.7	7	30.4	12	52.2
CR-4	2	6.9	12	41.4	11	37.9
CR-5			4	16.0	12	48.0
CR-6			13	32.5	17	42.5
CR-7			4	21.1	7	36.8
CR-8			3	42.9	4	57.1
CR-9	2	13.3	2	13.3	8	53.3
CR-10	2	7.1	8	28.6	15	53.6
CR-11			10	41.7	9	37.5
CR-12			8	42.1	8	42.1
CR-13	2	13.3	7	46.7	6	40.0
CR-14	2	8.0	8	32.0	10	40.0
CR-15	2	5.9	13	38.2	16	47.1
CR-16			4	33.3	8	66.7
CR-17	2	10.0	12	60.0	6	30.0
CR-18	1	5.0	9	45.0	8	40.0
CR-19			9	56.3	7	43.8
TOTAL	22	5.1	157	36.3	194	44.8

$r_s = .25$

APPENDIX D-3 (CONTINUED)

School	Unfavorable		Critical		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	1	5.9	1	5.9	17
CR-2	1	2.2			45
CR-3	2	8.7			23
CR-4	2	6.9	2	6.9	29
CR-5	9	36.0			25
CR-6	9	22.5	1	2.5	40
CR-7	6	31.6	2	10.5	19
CR-8					7
CR-9			3	20.0	15
CR-10	2	7.1	1	3.6	28
CR-11	5	20.8			24
CR-12	2	10.5	1	5.3	19
CR-13					15
CR-14	3	12.0	2	8.0	25
CR-15	2	5.9	1	2.9	34
CR-16					12
CR-17					20
CR-18	2	10.0			20
CR-19					16
TOTAL	46	10.6	14	3.2	433

APPENDIX D-4

4. Do you think your parents are interested in the school?

School	Keenly		Moderately		Indifferent	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	2	11.8	9	52.9		
CR-2	5	11.1	14	31.1	9	20.0
CR-3	2	8.7	11	47.8	5	21.7
CR-4	1	3.4	21	72.4	3	10.3
CR-5			13	52.0	3	12.0
CR-6			14	35.0	5	12.5
CR-7			10	55.6	3	16.7
CR-8			7	100.0		
CR-9	2	14.3	5	35.7	2	14.3
CR-10	2	7.1	10	35.7	8	28.6
CR-11	2	8.7	9	39.1	4	17.4
CR-12	1	5.3	10	52.6	4	21.1
CR-13			5	33.3	4	26.7
CR-14	1	4.0	6	24.0	5	20.0
CR-15	2	5.9	20	58.8	7	20.6
CR-16			11	91.7		
CR-17	2	10.0	13	65.0	3	15.0
CR-18	1	5.0	11	55.0	4	20.0
CR-19	4	25.0	8	50.0	2	12.5
TOTAL	27	6.3	207	48.1	71	16.5

$r_s = .33$

APPENDIX D-4 (CONTINUED)

School	Disinterested		Rejecting		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	6	35.3			17
CR-2	16	35.6	1	2.2	45
CR-3	5	21.7			23
CR-4	4	13.8			29
CR-5	8	32.0	1	4.0	25
CR-6	21	52.5			40
CR-7	5	27.8			18
CR-8					7
CR-9	5	35.7			14
CR-10	8	28.6			28
CR-11	8	34.8			23
CR-12	4	21.1			19
CR-13	6	40.0			15
CR-14	10	40.0	3	12.0	25
CR-15	4	11.8	1	2.9	34
CR-16	1	8.3			12
CR-17	2	10.0			20
CR-18	4	20.0			20
CR-19	2	12.5			16
TOTAL	119	27.7	6	1.4	430

APPENDIX D-5

5. Do students have a part in planning school programs?

School	None		Occasionally		Frequently	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1			7	43.8	1	6.3
CR-2	1	2.2	10	22.2	9	20.0
CR-3	2	8.7	6	26.1	5	21.7
CR-4	2	7.1	5	17.9	6	21.4
CR-5	2	8.0	10	40.0	3	12.0
CR-6	6	15.0	14	35.0	5	12.5
CR-7	3	16.7	9	50.0		
CR-8			1	16.7		
CR-9	2	13.3	2	13.3	1	6.7
CR-10	2	7.1	12	42.9	1	3.6
CR-11	3	12.5	4	16.7	4	16.7
CR-12			5	26.3	1	5.3
CR-13	2	12.5	10	62.5	1	6.3
CR-14	1	4.0	7	28.0	2	8.0
CR-15	3	9.1	8	24.2	1	3.0
CR-16	1	9.1	4	36.4		
CR-17	3	15.0	3	15.0	1	5.0
CR-18			7	36.8	4	21.1
CR-19			4	25.0	7	43.8
TOTAL	33	7.7	128	30.0	52	12.2

$r_s = .13$

APPENDIX D-5 (CONTINUED)

School	Regularly		Initiate		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	2	12.5	6	37.5	16
CR-2	6	13.3	19	42.2	45
CR-3	4	17.4	6	26.1	23
CR-4	2	7.1	13	46.4	28
CR-5			10	40.0	25
CR-6			15	37.5	40
CR-7	1	5.6	5	27.8	18
CR-8			5	83.3	6
CR-9	1	6.7	9	60.0	15
CR-10	1	3.6	12	42.9	28
CR-11	2	8.3	11	45.8	24
CR-12			13	68.4	19
CR-13	1	6.3	2	12.5	16
CR-14	1	4.0	14	56.0	25
CR-15	1	3.0	20	60.6	33
CR-16	1	9.1	5	45.5	11
CR-17	3	15.0	10	50.0	20
CR-18	1	5.3	7	36.8	19
CR-19			5	31.3	16
TOTAL	27	6.3	187	43.8	427

APPENDIX D-6

6. What do you do about extra-curricular activities?

School	Leader		Participant		Observer	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	1	5.9	3	17.6	12	70.6
CR-2	5	11.1	20	44.4	17	37.8
CR-3	2	8.7	7	30.4	9	39.1
CR-4	3	10.3	17	58.6	8	27.6
CR-5	6	24.0	7	28.0	9	36.0
CR-6	2	5.0	8	20.0	16	40.0
CR-7			6	33.3	7	38.9
CR-8	1	14.3	4	57.1	2	28.6
CR-9	6	40.0	1	6.7	4	26.7
CR-10	3	10.7	10	35.7	11	39.3
CR-11	8	34.8	8	34.8	4	17.4
CR-12	1	5.3	9	47.4	7	36.8
CR-13			4	28.6	8	57.1
CR-14	1	4.2	5	20.8	13	54.2
CR-15	8	24.2	11	33.3	10	30.3
CR-16	2	16.7	7	58.3	2	16.7
CR-17	8	40.0	6	30.0	4	20.0
CR-18	1	5.3	6	31.6	9	47.4
CR-19	2	12.5	9	56.3	5	31.3
TOTAL	60	14.0	148	34.7	157	36.8

$r_s = .29$

APPENDIX D-6 (CONTINUED)

School	Non-Participant		Lacking		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	1	5.9			17
CR-2	2	4.4	1	2.2	45
CR-3	3	13.0	2	8.7	23
CR-4	1	3.4			29
CR-5	3	12.0			25
CR-6	14	35.0			40
CR-7	3	16.7	2	11.1	18
CR-8					7
CR-9	2	13.3	2	13.3	15
CR-10	2	7.1	2	7.1	28
CR-11	3	13.0			23
CR-12	2	10.5			19
CR-13	2	14.3			14
CR-14	4	16.7	1	4.2	24
CR-15	3	9.1	1	3.0	33
CR-16			1	8.3	12
CR-17	1	5.0	1	5.0	20
CR-18	3	15.8			19
CR-19					16
TOTAL	49	11.5	13	3.0	427

APPENDIX D-7

7. How do students feel about your principal?

School	Severe		Respect		Admirable	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	1	7.1	6	42.9	1	7.1
CR-2	2	4.4	35	77.8	5	11.1
CR-3	2	9.1	12	54.5		
CR-4			17	81.0	1	4.8
CR-5			12	48.0	1	4.0
CR-6	4	10.3	12	30.8	3	7.7
CR-7	1	8.3	6	50.0	3	25.0
CR-8			6	85.7	1	14.3
CR-9	1	8.3	5	41.7	2	16.7
CR-10	11	44.0	10	40.0		
CR-11	3	13.6	14	63.6		
CR-12			15	78.9	2	10.5
CR-13	12	92.3				
CR-14	3	13.0	15	65.2	2	8.7
CR-15			18	60.0	3	10.0
CR-16	1	9.1	5	45.5	2	18.2
CR-17	3	15.8	15	78.9	1	5.3
CR-18	2	14.3	8	57.1	2	14.3
CR-19			13	81.3	2	12.5
TOTAL	46	11.8	224	57.6	31	8.0

$r_s = .44$

APPENDIX D-7 (CONTINUED)

School	Lax		Weak		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	1	7.1	5	35.7	14
CR-2	1	2.2	2	4.4	45
CR-3	4	18.2	4	18.2	22
CR-4	3	14.3			21
CR-5	8	32.0	4	16.0	25
CR-6	6	15.4	14	35.9	39
CR-7			2	16.7	12
CR-8					7
CR-9	3	25.0	1	8.3	12
CR-10	1	4.0	3	12.0	25
CR-11	3	13.6	2	9.1	22
CR-12	1	5.3	1	5.3	19
CR-13			1	7.7	13
CR-14	2	8.7	1	4.3	23
CR-15	7	23.3	2	6.7	30
CR-16	2	18.2	1	9.1	11
CR-17					19
CR-18	1	7.1	1	7.1	14
CR-19			1	6.3	16
TOTAL	43	11.1	45	11.6	389

APPENDIX D-8

8. How do you feel about the counselors in your school?

School	Concerned		Limited		Indifferent	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	12	70.6	2	11.8	1	5.9
CR-2	31	67.4	6	13.0	5	10.9
CR-3	12	54.5	6	27.3	3	13.6
CR-4	22	75.9	3	10.3	2	6.9
CR-5	14	56.0	2	8.0	4	16.0
CR-6	23	57.5	9	22.5	1	2.5
CR-7	1	5.6	9	50.0	4	22.2
CR-8	7	100.0				
CR-9	11	73.3				
CR-10	13	46.4	5	17.9	1	3.6
CR-11	15	62.5	3	12.5	4	16.7
CR-12	7	36.8	2	10.5	2	10.5
CR-13	6	33.3	2	11.1	3	16.7
CR-14	10	40.0	2	8.0	11	44.0
CR-15	13	41.9	5	16.1	8	25.8
CR-16	7	58.3	5	41.7		
CR-17	17	89.5	2	10.5		
CR-18	10	50.0	6	30.0	1	5.0
CR-19	13	81.3	2	12.5		
TOTAL	244	56.6	71	16.5	50	11.6

$r_s = .00$

APPENDIX D-8 (CONTINUED)

School	Discipline		Don't Know		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	1	5.9	1	5.9	17
CR-2	1	2.2	3	6.5	46
CR-3	1	4.5			22
CR-4			2	6.9	29
CR-5			5	20.0	25
CR-6			7	17.5	40
CR-7	2	11.1	2	11.1	18
CR-8					7
CR-9			4	26.7	15
CR-10	2	7.1	7	25.0	28
CR-11			2	8.3	24
CR-12	5	26.3	3	15.8	19
CR-13	6	33.3	1	5.6	18
CR-14	2	8.0			25
CR-15			5	16.1	31
CR-16					12
CR-17					19
CR-18	1	5.0	2	10.0	20
CR-19			1	6.3	16
TOTAL	21	4.9	45	10.4	431

APPENDIX D-9

9. How strict are your teachers?

School	Excessive		Balanced		Lenient		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	2	11.8	14	82.4	1	5.9	17
CR-2	2	4.4	41	91.1	2	4.4	45
CR-3			17	77.3	5	22.7	22
CR-4	2	6.9	25	86.2	2	6.9	29
CR-5	1	4.0	21	84.0	3	12.0	25
CR-6	2	5.0	36	90.0	2	5.0	40
CR-7	2	11.1	15	83.3	1	5.6	18
CR-8			7	100.0			7
CR-9			12	80.0	3	20.0	15
CR-10	1	3.6	24	85.7	3	10.7	28
CR-11			23	95.8	1	4.2	24
CR-12	2	10.5	17	89.5			19
CR-13			15	100.0			15
CR-14	4	16.0	19	76.0	2	8.0	25
CR-15	1	2.9	29	85.3	4	11.8	34
CR-16	1	8.3	9	75.0	2	16.7	12
CR-17	2	10.0	17	85.0	1	5.0	20
CR-18			16	80.0	4	20.0	20
CR-19			14	87.5	2	12.5	16
TOTAL	22	5.1	371	86.1	38	8.8	431

$r_s = .00$

APPENDIX D-10

10. Does your school have a statement on student rights and responsibilities?

School	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	11	64.7			6	35.3	17
CR-2	35	77.8	1	2.2	9	20.0	45
CR-3	11	47.8			12	52.2	23
CR-4	23	79.3			6	20.7	29
CR-5	17	68.0	1	4.0	7	28.0	25
CR-6	25	62.5	2	5.0	13	32.5	40
CR-7	8	42.1			11	57.9	19
CR-8	5	71.4			2	28.6	7
CR-9	11	73.3			4	26.7	15
CR-10	22	78.6	1	3.6	5	17.9	28
CR-11	13	54.2	1	4.2	10	41.7	24
CR-12	16	84.2	1	5.3	2	10.5	19
CR-13	5	33.3	1	6.7	9	60.0	15
CR-14	17	68.0	1	4.0	7	28.0	25
CR-15	28	82.4	1	2.9	5	14.7	34
CR-16	4	33.3	1	8.3	7	58.3	12
CR-17	13	65.0			7	35.0	20
CR-18	12	60.0	1	5.0	7	35.0	20
CR-19	10	62.5	1	6.3	5	31.3	16
TOTAL	286	66.1	13	3.0	134	30.9	433

APPENDIX D-11

11. Does your school have a written policy for handling discipline problems?

School	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	4	23.5	1	5.9	12	70.6	17
CR-2	21	46.7	3	6.7	21	46.7	45
CR-3	8	34.8	1	4.3	14	60.9	23
CR-4	25	86.2			4	13.8	29
CR-5	12	48.0	2	8.0	11	44.0	25
CR-6	28	70.0			12	30.0	40
CR-7	11	57.9	1	5.3	7	36.8	19
CR-8	5	71.4			2	28.6	7
CR-9	10	66.7			5	33.3	15
CR-10	21	75.0			7	25.0	28
CR-11	9	37.5			15	62.5	24
CR-12	11	57.9			8	42.1	19
CR-13	10	66.7	1	6.7	4	26.7	15
CR-14	10	40.0	2	8.0	13	52.0	25
CR-15	30	88.2			4	11.8	34
CR-16	4	33.3	1	8.3	7	58.3	12
CR-17	9	45.0	1	5.0	10	50.0	20
CR-18	10	50.0			10	50.0	20
CR-19	7	43.8			9	56.3	16
TOTAL	245	56.6	13	3.0	175	40.4	433

APPENDIX D-12

12. What do you do when you see a student damaging school property?

School	Report		Persuade		Talk	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1			4	25.0	3	18.8
CR-2	7	15.6	10	22.2	10	22.2
CR-3	3	12.5	6	25.0	4	16.7
CR-4	2	7.4	6	22.2	14	51.9
CR-5	4	16.0	9	36.0	5	20.0
CR-6	2	5.0	4	10.0	9	22.5
CR-7			2	11.8	9	52.9
CR-8			1	14.3	3	42.9
CR-9	2	15.4	4	30.8	6	46.2
CR-10	4	14.8	6	22.2	8	29.6
CR-11	2	8.3			10	41.7
CR-12	3	15.8			11	57.9
CR-13			3	23.1	5	38.5
CR-14	2	7.7	4	15.4	10	38.5
CR-15	3	8.8	2	5.9	13	38.2
CR-16	2	16.6	4	33.3	4	33.3
CR-17	1	5.3	3	15.8	5	26.3
CR-18	3	15.0	4	20.0	8	40.0
CR-19			7	43.8	7	43.8
TOTAL	40	9.4	79	18.6	144	34.0

$r_s = .23$

APPENDIX D-12 (CONTINUED)

School	Join		Walk Away		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1			9	56.3	16
CR-2	2	4.4	16	35.6	45
CR-3	4	16.7	7	29.2	24
CR-4			5	18.5	27
CR-5			7	28.0	25
CR-6	8	20.0	17	42.5	40
CR-7	3	17.6	3	17.6	17
CR-8			3	42.9	7
CR-9	1	7.7			13
CR-10	1	3.7	8	29.6	27
CR-11	1	4.2	11	45.8	24
CR-12			5	26.3	19
CR-13			5	38.5	13
CR-14	3	11.5	7	26.9	26
CR-15	2	5.9	14	41.2	34
CR-16			2	16.6	12
CR-17			10	52.6	19
CR-18			5	25.0	20
CR-19			2	12.5	16
TOTAL	25	5.9	136	32.1	424

APPENDIX D-13

13. How would you describe the bathroom facilities at your school?

School	No Problems		Smoking		To Smoke	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	6	35.3	6	35.3	1	5.9
CR-2	5	11.1	25	55.6	1	2.2
CR-3	8	38.1	7	33.3	4	19.0
CR-4	4	14.8	11	40.7	8	29.6
CR-5	4	16.0	9	36.0	1	4.0
CR-6	14	35.9	12	30.8	3	7.7
CR-7	3	17.6	7	41.2	3	17.6
CR-8	3	42.9	1	14.3		
CR-9	4	26.7	6	40.0	2	13.3
CR-10	10	34.5	12	41.4	1	3.4
CR-11	2	7.4	7	25.9	4	14.8
CR-12	6	31.6	7	36.8	2	10.5
CR-13	3	23.1	4	30.8	4	30.8
CR-14	8	33.3	8	33.3	1	4.2
CR-15	12	35.3	15	44.1	1	2.9
CR-16	4	33.3	4	33.3		
CR-17	9	42.9	10	47.6		
CR-18	9	45.0	9	45.0		
CR-19	3	18.8	9	56.3		
TOTAL	117	27.3	169	39.5	36	8.4

$r_s = .44$

APPENDIX D-13 (CONTINUED)

School	Fights		Bullies		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	2	11.8	2	11.8	17
CR-2	8	17.8	6	13.3	45
CR-3	1	4.8	1	4.8	21
CR-4	3	11.1	1	3.7	27
CR-5	9	36.0	2	8.0	25
CR-6	6	15.4	4	10.3	39
CR-7	2	11.8	2	11.8	17
CR-8	3	42.9			7
CR-9	1	6.7	2	13.3	15
CR-10	5	17.2	1	3.4	29
CR-11	2	7.4	12	44.4	27
CR-12	3	15.8	1	5.3	19
CR-13	2	15.4			13
CR-14	5	20.8	2	8.3	24
CR-15	5	14.7	1	2.9	34
CR-16	4	33.3			12
CR-17	2	9.5			21
CR-18	2	10.0			20
CR-19	4	25.0			16
TOTAL	69	16.1	37	8.6	428

APPENDIX D-14

14. To what extent are drugs (pot and pills) a problem at your school?

School	Sold/Used Over Half		Sold/Used Less Half		Used Over Half	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	4	25.0	4	25.0		
CR-2	3	6.8	5	11.4	7	15.9
CR-3	4	20.0	4	20.0	6	30.0
CR-4	5	20.8	7	29.2	3	12.5
CR-5	9	36.0	9	36.0	2	8.0
CR-6	12	32.4	4	10.8	5	13.5
CR-7	12	66.7	4	22.2	1	5.6
CR-8	1	14.3	3	42.9		
CR-9	3	23.1	3	23.1	4	30.8
CR-10	5	18.5	10	37.0	2	7.4
CR-11	5	21.7	4	17.4	5	21.7
CR-12	5	27.8	3	16.7	4	22.2
CR-13	4	33.3	2	16.7	2	16.7
CR-14	6	30.0	2	10.0	6	30.0
CR-15	5	17.9	7	25.0	2	7.1
CR-16			2	18.2		
CR-17	1	5.6	2	11.1	5	27.8
CR-18			4	22.2	5	27.8
CR-19	2	12.5	1	6.3	5	31.3
TOTAL	86	21.8	80	20.2	64	16.2

$r_s = .32$

APPENDIX D-14 (CONTINUED)

School	Used Less Half		Very Few		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	4	25.0	4	25.0	16
CR-2	16	36.4	13	29.5	44
CR-3	4	20.0	2	10.0	20
CR-4	5	20.8	4	16.7	24
CR-5	5	20.0			25
CR-6	7	18.9	9	24.3	37
CR-7	1	5.6			18
CR-8	2	28.6	1	14.3	7
CR-9	2	15.4	1	7.7	13
CR-10	6	22.2	4	14.8	27
CR-11	6	26.1	3	13.0	23
CR-12	3	16.7	3	16.7	18
CR-13	3	25.0	1	8.3	12
CR-14	2	10.0	4	20.0	20
CR-15	7	25.0	7	25.0	28
CR-16	4	36.4	5	45.5	11
CR-17	4	22.2	6	33.3	18
CR-18	3	16.7	6	33.3	18
CR-19	4	25.0	4	25.0	16
TOTAL	88	22.3	77	19.5	395

APPENDIX D-15

15. How would you describe the student-teacher relationship at your school?

School	Respect All		Respect Most		Hassle	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	1	5.9	13	76.5	3	17.6
CR-2	4	8.7	22	47.8	13	28.3
CR-3	1	4.8	11	52.4	7	33.3
CR-4			18	64.3	8	28.6
CR-5			15	60.0	6	24.0
CR-6	1	2.4	21	51.2	18	43.9
CR-7			6	31.6	11	57.9
CR-8			4	57.1	3	42.9
CR-9			7	43.8	6	37.5
CR-10	1	3.4	17	58.6	9	31.0
CR-11	1	3.7	14	51.9	12	44.4
CR-12	1	5.3	11	57.9	7	36.8
CR-13			11	64.7	5	29.4
CR-14			18	75.0	3	12.5
CR-15			21	55.3	15	39.5
CR-16			6	50.0	6	50.0
CR-17			16	80.0	4	20.0
CR-18			19	95.0	1	5.0
CR-19	1	6.3	9	56.3	5	31.3
TOTAL	11	2.5	259	58.6	142	32.1

$r_s = .40$

APPENDIX D-15 (CONTINUED)

School	Some Trouble		Excessive Trouble		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1					17
CR-2	6	13.0	1	2.2	46
CR-3	2	9.5			21
CR-4	1	3.6	1	3.6	28
CR-5	3	12.0	1	4.0	25
CR-6	1	2.4			41
CR-7	1	5.3	1	5.3	19
CR-8					7
CR-9	3	18.8			16
CR-10	2	6.9			29
CR-11					27
CR-12					19
CR-13	1	5.9			17
CR-14	2	8.3	1	4.2	24
CR-15	2	5.3			38
CR-16					12
CR-17					20
CR-18					20
CR-19	1	6.3			16
TOTAL	25	5.7	5	1.1	442

APPENDIX D-16

16. Why do students damage school property and/or create disturbances/indulge in acts of violence on the school campus?

School	Boredom		Fun		Status	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	4	23.5	2	11.8	2	11.8
CR-2	9	19.6	3	6.5	11	23.9
CR-3	5	22.7	7	31.8	4	18.2
CR-4	9	23.7	5	13.2	7	18.4
CR-5	3	12.0	2	8.0	8	32.0
CR-6	12	27.3	6	13.6	7	15.9
CR-7	11	47.8	4	17.4	2	8.7
CR-8	2	22.2	1	11.1		
CR-9	3	17.6			3	17.6
CR-10	5	15.6	4	12.5	5	15.6
CR-11	6	24.0	5	20.0	6	24.0
CR-12	4	22.2	4	22.2	4	22.2
CR-13	6	28.6	3	14.3	4	19.0
CR-14	5	18.5	5	18.5	8	29.6
CR-15	8	24.2	7	21.2	3	9.1
CR-16	3	25.0	1	8.3	2	16.7
CR-17	3	14.3	2	9.5	3	14.3
CR-18	4	20.0	2	10.0	7	35.0
CR-19	4	25.0	1	6.3	1	6.3
TOTAL	106	22.7	64	13.7	87	18.7

APPENDIX D-16 (CONTINUED)

School	Attention		Resentment		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	2	11.8	7	41.1	17
CR-2	18	39.1	5	10.9	46
CR-3	5	22.7	1	4.5	22
CR-4	8	21.1	9	23.7	38
CR-5	5	20.0	7	28.0	25
CR-6	14	31.8	5	11.4	44
CR-7	3	13.0	3	13.0	23
CR-8	3	33.3	3	33.3	9
CR-9	9	52.9	2	11.8	17
CR-10	9	28.1	9	28.1	32
CR-11	6	24.0	2	8.0	25
CR-12	4	22.2	2	11.1	18
CR-13	4	19.0	4	19.0	21
CR-14	4	14.8	5	18.5	27
CR-15	9	27.3	6	18.2	33
CR-16	5	41.7	1	8.3	12
CR-17	8	38.1	5	23.8	21
CR-18	5	25.0	2	10.0	20
CR-19	7	43.8	3	18.8	16
TOTAL	128	27.5	81	17.4	466

APPENDIX D-17

17. What do you feel might be a solution to the problem of vandalism and violence on the high school campus?

School	More Discipline		Activities		Curriculum	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CR-1	6	28.6	5	23.8	2	9.5
CR-2	12	25.5	10	21.3	3	6.4
CR-3	4	20.0	8	40.0	3	15.0
CR-4	4	13.8	5	17.2	4	13.8
CR-5	6	24.0	3	12.0	3	12.0
CR-6	5	12.8	13	33.3	3	7.7
CR-7	2	11.1	6	33.3	6	33.3
CR-8	1	14.3	1	14.3		
CR-9	2	12.5	4	25.0	1	6.3
CR-10	4	13.8	8	27.6	3	10.3
CR-11	6	25.0	6	25.0	4	16.7
CR-12	4	21.1	4	21.1	8	42.1
CR-13	1	5.6	8	44.4	4	22.2
CR-14	1	5.3	7	36.8	2	10.5
CR-15	9	22.5	7	17.5	7	17.5
CR-16	4	30.8	5	38.5	1	7.7
CR-17	2	10.0	7	35.0	3	15.0
CR-18	1	5.0	6	30.0	3	15.0
CR-19	4	25.0	8	50.0		
TOTAL	78	17.7	121	27.5	60	13.6

APPENDIX D-17 (CONTINUED)

School	Security		Expulsion		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
CR-1	6	28.6	2	9.5	21
CR-2	8	17.0	14	29.8	47
CR-3	2	10.0	3	15.0	20
CR-4	13	44.8	3	10.3	29
CR-5	8	32.0	5	20.0	25
CR-6	12	30.8	6	15.4	39
CR-7	1	5.6	3	16.7	18
CR-8	5	71.4			7
CR-9	5	31.3	4	25.0	16
CR-10	5	17.2	9	31.0	29
CR-11	5	20.8	3	12.5	24
CR-12	1	5.3	2	10.5	19
CR-13	1	5.6	4	22.2	18
CR-14	5	26.3	4	21.1	19
CR-15	9	22.5	8	20.0	40
CR-16	1	7.7	2	15.4	13
CR-17	1	5.0	7	35.0	20
CR-18	4	20.0	6	30.0	20
CR-19	1	6.3	3	18.8	16
TOTAL	93	21.1	88	20.0	440

"END OF DOCUMENT"